DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 458 CE 018 000

AUTHOR	Wilson, Thurlow R.; And Others
TITLE	Employment Services for Older Job Seekers. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Administration on Aging (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	HumRRO-FR-ED-78-9
PUB DATE	Jun 78
GRANT	90-A-1024
NOTE	247p.; Appended tables may not reproduce well because of broken type
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$12.71 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Agency Role; Demonstration Programs; Employment Opportunities; *Employment Problems; Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; Financial Needs; Job Applicants; Job Market; Job Search Methods; Legislation; Males; National Surveys; Needs Assessment; *Nonprofit Organizations; *Older Adults; *Participant Characteristics; Regional Programs; Senior Citizens; Social Discrimination; *State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Older Americans Act; Older Americans Act Title IX; Senior Community Service Employment Program

ABSTRACT

Results are presented of a project to analyze employment assistance given to persons fifty-five or older and to recommend improvements in older job seekers' employment services. (The project evolved from income security concerns expressed in the Older Americans Act.) The report, divided into seven chapters, reviews employment characteristics and needs of older job seekers in chapter 1. This chapter also examines the job market, employment services, and legislation relative to the older worker. Chapter 2 presents the methodology used in the job seeker survey and the studies of senior nonprofit employment offices and state and regional aging offices. Chapter 3 reports on the older job seekers' survey and interview results. Chapter 4 includes findings related to senior nonprofit employment offices. Chapter 5 examines how state employment security agencies might augment services to aid older job seekers. In chapter 6 the role of regional and state offices on aging in employment programs is considered. The final chapter summarizes and discusses older job seekers' problems and needs, State Employment Office assistance, the State Office on Aging's employment role, and recommendations. References, three appendixes (data collection instruments, New York training workshop report, and job seeker survey responses), and forty-five tables are included. (CSS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Final Report
78-9

HumRRO
FR-ED-78-9

ED159458

HumRRO

Employment Services for Older Job Seekers

by

Thurlow R. Wilson
Deborah H. Bercini
John A. Richards

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION
300 North Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

June 1978

The material in this report was prepared under Grant (90-A-1024) from the Administration on Aging, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. Therefore points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Administration on Aging. The Grantee is solely responsible for the contents of the report.

CE018000

Foreword

This report describes the result of a study of employment services available to older workers. The study was conducted from October, 1976 to March, 1978 under grant (90-A-1024) from the Administration on Aging (Department of Health, Education and Welfare). The principal objective of the research was to analyze the employment assistance being given to persons 55 or older, and to recommend needed improvements in employment services for older job seekers.

The research project, code named OLDER WORKER, included (1) a nationwide survey of older applicants to State Employment Service offices and to senior nonprofit employment offices; (2) an analysis of the operations of senior nonprofit employment offices; (3) an analysis of the services for older workers provided by State Employment Security Agencies; and (4) an examination of the Offices on Aging in several states to determine their role in facilitating the employment of older job seekers.

The support of the Administration on Aging was a valuable asset throughout the study. We are grateful to the guidance provided by Dr. Saadia Greenberg, technical monitor for the study.

The cooperation of the U.S. Department of Labor was a critical factor in enabling us to perform parts of this research. DoL personnel made arrangements for interviews with State Employment Service Agency staff in several states and for distribution of questionnaires through selected State Employment Service local offices. We wish to thank Mr. Oscar Gjernes, Chief of Special Applicant Unit, for coordinating our contacts with DoL regional offices and State Employment Security Agencies.

The staff of the Virginia Employment Commission and that of the Virginia Office on Aging gave valuable suggestions during the planning of the study. Our special thanks go to Ms. Pamela Lathrop of VOA and Ms. Janette Christian of VEC.

We wish especially to acknowledge our gratitude to the older job seekers and senior nonprofit employment office directors who responded to our surveys, and to those program administrators who kindly granted us personal interviews. We hope that this report will prove of value to them.

The research was performed by HumRRO Eastern Division, Alexandria, Virginia. Dr. Robert J. Seidel is the Division Director.

The principal investigator for this study was Dr. Thurlow R. Wilson. Mr. John A. Richards and Ms. Deborah H. Bercini were the principal staff members. Mr. Mark Eitelberg and Mr. Roger Gunwaldsen served as members of the research staff during portions of the study. Editor for this report was Ms. June Cunningham. Consultation during planning was given by Ms. Mary Ann Ormes, director of Senior Citizens Employment and Services of Alexandria and Dr. Herbert Parnes, professor of economics of Ohio State University.

Table of Contents

Page

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS ix
Background. ix
Research Objective. x
Approach. x
Summary of Findings xi
Survey of Older Job Seekers xi
Study of Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices for Older Job Seekers xii
State Employment Service Assistance to Older Workers. xiii
The Role in Employment of the State Office on Aging xiv
Recommendations xv

CHAPTER

1 INTRODUCTION 1
Review of Information on the Employment Characteristics and Needs of Older Job Seekers 2
Age and Job Discrimination. 2
Job Performance of Older Workers. 2
Discouraged Older Job Seekers 3
Duration of Unemployment 3
Retirement and Need for Work. 4
Job Market for Older Workers 4
Employment Services to Older Job Seekers 5
Recent Developments in Older Worker Legislation. 5
OVERVIEW 7

2 METHODOLOGY 9
Overview 9
Survey of Older Job Seekers 9
Study of Service Nonprofit Employment Offices 9
Study of State and Regional Offices on Aging. 10
Job Seeker Survey. 10
Purpose 10
The Sample. 10
Procedures. 10
Questionnaire Topics. 13
Response Rate 13
Problems Encountered in Conduct of Survey and Countermeasures Taken 16
Confidentially. 17
Telephone Interviews with Job Seekers 18
Study of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices 19
Survey Sample 19
Survey Procedures 19
Topics Covered in Questionnaire 20
Response Rate 20
Problems Encountered and Countermeasures Taken. 20

CHAPTER Page

Case Studies of Selected Senior Nonprofit Offices 21
Study of State and Regional Offices on Aging and Departments of Labor 21
Selection of Regional and State Offices 22
Regional Office Study 22
State Office Study. 22
Special Study of Older Worker Programs in One State 23
Other Information Gathered 23

3 STUDY OF OLDER JOB SEEKERS. 24
Results of the Survey of Older Job Seekers 24
Description of Survey Respondents 24
Needs and Characteristics of Respondents and Type of Employment Office Visited. 32
Comparison of Respondents by Age Group. 37
Comparison of Female and Male Job Seekers 37
Duration of Unemployment. 47
Change in Occupation. 52
Interviews with Older Job Seekers. 52
Job Change 59
Help From Senior Nonprofit Employment Office. 59
Assistance From State Employment Service Offices. 63
Age Discrimination by Employers 63
Summary. 65
Reason for Seeking Work 65
Kind of Work Sought 65
Kinds of People Served by Various Types of Employment Offices 66
Experiences of Employer Discrimination Because of Age . . . 66
Kinds of Employment Help Generally Wanted 66
Special Needs of Various Kinds of Older Job Seekers 67
Degree of Satisfaction With Service of the Employment Office. 67

4 STUDY OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES. 69
Scope of the Study 69
Survey Findings 71
Structure of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices. 71
Applicants to Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices 79
How Applicants Learn About Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices. 83
Employers and Jobs 85
Services Provided to Applicants 90
Relationships With State Employment Security Agencies . . . 92
Summary 94
Case Studies of Selected Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices . . 95
Office A 96
Office B 96
Office C 97
Office D 97
Office E 98
Office F 98
Office G 99

CHAPTER Page

5 AUGMENTING STATE EMPLOYMENT SECURITY AGENCY SERVICES TO OLDER JOB SEEKERS. 101
  The Spokane Senior Workers Service 102
    How to Set Up an Employment Service for Senior Workers at No Cost to Employer or Applicant and With no Budget for Administration. 103
    Comments 105
  Project RENEW. 106
  Discussion 110

6 THE ROLE OF REGIONAL AND STATE OFFICES ON AGING IN EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS FOR OLDER WORKERS 112
  Employment Role of the Regional Offices on Aging 112
    Title IX 112
    CETA 113
    Interagency Planning 113
    Interaction with Regional Department of Labor Office . . 113
    Summary. 114
  Employment Role of the State Office on Aging 114
    Manpower Activities Engaged in by State Offices on Aging 114
    Concerns Often Expressed by State Office on Aging Staff. 118
  Outstanding Manpower Activity by State Offices on Aging. . . 118
    New York State Training Workshop on Employment of Older People. 119
    Employment of Older People and the Virginia Long-Range Plan for the Elderly 119
    Employment and the California Long-Range Plan on Aging . 121
    Employment Needs Described by the Survey of Older Residents of Washington State 123
    The Iowa Employment Projects for Older People. 124
  Summary. 125

7 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS. 126
  Problems and Needs of Older Job Seekers. 126
    Major Areas of Help Sought 127
    Special Needs of Certain Categories of Respondents . . . 127
    Recent Helpful Legislation 128
  Employment Assistance to Older Job Seekers 128
    Assistance Through State Employment Service. 128
    Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices for Seniors . . . 130
    Public Service Employment. 131
    Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) 131
    Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). . . 132
  Role of the State Office on Aging in Employment. 134
    Administration of Title IX Programs. 135
    Handbook on Employment Services for the Elderly. 136

CHAPTER Page

Comments on Handbook by Project OLDER WORKER Research Staff. 137
Recommendations 138
Provide Additional Assistance to Older Job Seekers Through State Employment Security Agencies. 139
Promote the Use of State Offices on Aging as Centers for Planning and Coordinating Employment Services for Older Workers 139
Help Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices to Increase Their Effectiveness 140
Evaluate the Impact of SCSEP and CETA on the Employment of Older Persons. 141

REFERENCES. 143

APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND LETTERS 147

Letter to Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices requesting their participation in the Job Seeker Survey 148
Instruction to Employment Office Staff for distribution of Survey Packets:
for Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices 150
for SESA Local Offices 151
Letter to Forty Plus Offices 152
The Job Seeker Survey Packet
Outer Envelope of Packet 153
Letter to Job Applicant 154
Job Seeker Questionnaire 156
Job Seeker Telephone Interview Guide 160
Letter to Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices Introducing Survey of Senior Offices 168
Senior Nonprofit Employment Office Questionnaire 169
Project OLDER WORKER Information Sheet 174

APPENDIX B

REPORT AND DISCUSSION OF NEW YORK STATE TRAINING WORKSHOP ON EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PEOPLE 175

Conference Objectives and Plan 176
Purposes and Goals 177
Age Discrimination in Employment 178
Application of Age Audits 181
New Legislation Affecting Older Worker Employment 182
Manpower Programs for Older Workers 183
Area Agencies on Aging and Title IX 187
Job Placement and Job Development/Counseling 188
CETA and New Project Approach to Public Service Employment 193

Page

APPENDIX C

TABULATIONS OF JOB SEEKER SURVEY RESPONSES
TABLES BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE 197

C-1 Most Recent Job (Occupational Group) 198
C-2 Type of Employer in Most Recent Job 199
C-3 Hours Worked Per Week in Most Recent Job 200
C-4 Annual Earnings in Most Recent Job 201
C-5 Labor Force Status at Time of Survey 202
C-6 Duration of Unemployment 203
C-7 Reason for Leaving Most Recent Job 204
C-8 Reason for Seeking Work 205
C-9 Ability to Accept Work at Time of Survey 206
C-10 Thought Employers Did Not Hire Due to Age 207
C-11 Type of Employment Help Wanted 208
C-12 Satisfaction with Employment Help Received 209
C-13 Total Family Income in 1976 210
C-14 Total Family Income if Not Working 211
C-15 How Family Would Manage if Not Working 212
C-16 Would Work Even if Money Not Needed 213
C-17 Job Sought (Occupational Group) 214
C-18 Job Sought Compared to Recent Job 215
C-19 Desired Hours Per Week in Job Sought 216
C-20 Annual Earnings Desired in Job Sought 217
C-21 Difference in Hourly Pay in Recent Job and Job Sought 218
C-22 Restrictions Placed on Job Sought 219
C-23 Confidence in Finding the Right Job Soon 220
C-24 Retired From a Previous Job 221
C-25 Forced to Retire by Employer 222
C-26 Age Group 223
C-27 Highest Level of School Completed 224
C-28 Marital Status 225

TABLES

2.1 Number of Survey Packets Sent, Distributed, and Returned for Three Types of Employment Offices 14
2.2 Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices Returning One Survey or None 15
2.3 Response Rates for Public (SESA), Senior Nonprofit, and Forty Plus Employment Offices 16
3.1 Selected Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents 55 Years of Age and Over. 25
3.2 Employment Characteristics of all Survey Respondents 55 Years of Age and Over 26
3.3 Restrictions Placed on Job Sought by Survey Respondents 55 Years of Age and Over 28
3.4 Employment Help Wanted by Survey Respondents 55 Years of Age or Older 29
3.5 Occupation by Sex and Age for Those 55 or Older as Estimated From the Current Population Survey and for Survey of Employment Office Applicants. 30

TABLES Page

3.6 Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Employment Office Type. 33
3.7 Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Employment Office Type 34
3.8 Employment Help Wanted by Survey Respondents by Type of Employment Office 36
3.9 Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Age Group 38
3.10 Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Age Group. 39
3.11 Employment Help Wanted by Survey Respondents by Age Group . . . 41
3.12 Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Sex 43
3.13 Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Sex 44
3.14 Employment Help Wanted by Survey Respondents by Sex. 46
3.15 Demographic Characteristics of Unemployed Survey Respondents by Duration of Unemployment. 48
3.16 Employment Characteristics of Unemployed Survey Respondents by Duration of Unemployment. 49
3.17 Employment Help Wanted by Unemployed Survey Respondents by Duration of Unemployment 51
3.18 Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Whether Job Sought is in Same Field as Last Job. 53
3.19 Employment Characteristics of Survey Respondents by Whether Job Sought is in Same Field as Las Job 54
3.20 Employment Help Wanted by Survey Respondents by Whether Job Sought is in Same Field as Last Job. 56
3.21 Seeking Same or Different Kind of Work by Type of Recent Job . . 57
3.22 Type of Work Sought by Survey Respondents Seeking a Type of Job Different From Their Recent Job 58
3.23 Job Shifts and Reasons Reported by Survey Respondents Who Were Interviewed 60
3.24 Employment Help Wanted and Received From Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices 62
4.1 Main Source of Financial Support for Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 72
4.2 Total Annual Budget in 1977 for Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations 75
4.3 Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices by Size of Staff 77
4.4 Percent of Total Staff Consisting of Part-Time Workers and Volunteer Workers by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Offices . . . 77
4.5 Average Number of New Applicants Per Month by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 78
4.6 Proportion of Applicants in Three Age Groups by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 79
4.7 Proportion of White, Male Applicants by Percent of Senior Non-Profit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations 80

TABLES

Page

4.8 Proportion of Applicants in Three Educational Groups by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 81

4.9 Proportion of Applicants Who Previously Held White-Collar Job by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations 82

4.10 Proportion of Applicants Seeking Part-Time Work by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 83

4.11 Methods by Which Applicants Learn About Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 84

4.12 Sources of Job Listings at Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations 86

4.13 Perception by Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations of Employers' Receptiveness to Hiring Older Workers 87

4.14 Types of Job Openings by Frequency of Demand by Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations 89

4.15 Proportion of Office Time Spent on Employment Assistance at Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 90

4.16 Services Provided to Most or all Applicants at Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations. 91

4.17 Percent of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices and Forty Plus Organizations Reporting Frequent Interactions with the State Employment Service (SESA). 93

6.1 Plans Regarding Employment of Older Workers Mentioned in State Office on Aging 1978 Annual Plans for 25 States. 116

Summary and Conclusions

BACKGROUND

The Older Americans Act affirms the right of older people to "an adequate income in retirement," "Employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age," and "meaningful employment opportunities."

Research on older workers has demonstrated that older people often do need to continue working. In fact, an inadequate income in retirement may necessitate a post-retirement job. However, a great number of older job seekers experience severe difficulties in the job market. They tend to require a longer period of time to look for a job than do younger workers, and many become discouraged and give up actively looking for work. Because of the number of discouraged older job seekers who drop out of the labor market, the unemployment rates for this age group considerably understate the extent of employment problems.

Despite the Age Discrimination Act of 1967, discrimination against older workers because of age continues to be widespread. This conclusion is based on the opinions of employers as well as on the results of studies documenting the differential treatment by employers of older and younger job applicants. Research shows, however, that older workers generally perform as well as younger workers as judged by overall job productivity, number of job-related accidents, work capacity, and ability to learn.

In the last few years there have been major changes in programs to assist older job seekers:

- There has been a deemphasis in the use of older worker specialists at the State Employment Service offices. Services to older applicants at public employment offices have declined sharply compared to services to younger applicants.
- Through a recent national demonstration project (RENEW), elderly workers paid through public service employment programs have worked in local State Employment Service offices to provide special help to older applicants.
- A number of voluntary nonprofit employment offices catering to older workers have been established throughout the country.
- The Senior Community Service Employment Program of Title IX (SCSEP), Older Americans Act, has provided public service employment for low income people who are 55 or older. Funding for the program has been greatly increased this year. Since their inception, Title IX programs have been managed by five national contractors, but in the last year, for the first time, a portion of the Title IX appropriation was set aside for the states to administer at their discretion.

- The Comprehensive Employment Training Act of 1973 (CETA), through local prime sponsors, has furnished training and public service jobs to a number of older workers. Older workers are underrepresented in CETA when the proportion of older persons in the underemployed population is considered.

Recent legislation promises to alleviate some of the employment problems faced by older workers. The earning limit for Social Security payments has been raised, permitting retirees to legally obtain a supplementary income better corresponding to their financial needs. In addition, the permissible mandatory retirement age was raised from 65 to 70 for private sector employees, and age-based retirement rules were abolished for most Federal workers.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The general purpose of this project was to analyze the assistance being given to those 55 or older in finding employment, and to recommend needed improvements. The specific goals were (1) to describe and understand the employment needs and experiences of elderly job seekers; (2) to describe and analyze the employment assistance currently available, including assistance through the State Employment Service, SCSEP and CETA; and (3) to examine the role played by the State Offices on Aging in facilitating the employment of older job seekers.

APPROACH

For the analysis of employment services available to older workers, information and comments were obtained from a number of sources.

- Older persons who applied to selected State Employment Service offices and senior nonprofit employment offices were asked to complete a questionnaire on their employment needs and experiences. Responses were obtained from 1,052 job seekers aged 55 or older. Fifty-one survey respondents who reported severe employment difficulties were interviewed in depth by telephone.

- All known senior nonprofit employment offices were surveyed by mail to learn about their operations, with 60 out of 80 offices responding. Project researchers visited eight of these nonprofit offices to interview staff members and to learn by observation how the offices function.

- Researchers visited several regional and state Offices on Aging to learn about their role in providing employment assistance to older persons.

- Discussions were held with Regional and State Employment Service representatives to find out about their activities in behalf of older workers.

- Interviews were conducted with representatives of each of the Title IX national contractors to provide information about the operation of their respective Senior Community Service Employment Programs.

- Published reports and other materials on employment of older workers were examined.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Survey of Older Job Seekers

Most of the older workers surveyed reported they were seeking work because of the need for additional income. However, their desire for employment was not solely financial, since many said they would want to work even if they had enough money to live comfortably without working.

For half of the respondents, the kind of work sought was the same as that performed in their most recent job. Those retired were more likely to consider a different type of job, and were often interested in part-time work at a lower hourly wage than they had received on their previous job. A fourth of all people replying could not name the title or duties of the job they sought, but they could specify the wages they wanted, the number of hours per week desired, and the restrictions they would place on working conditions. The majority of respondents would not consider a job requiring a move to another city, out-of-town travel, or evening or night work; but few would rule out work requiring overtime. Most said their health did not limit the kind or amount of work they could do.

The different types of employment offices involved in the survey were found to serve different kinds of people. Forty Plus clubs deal almost exclusively with white, middle-aged men who have held professional or managerial jobs. (To be considered for Forty Plus membership, an individual is generally required to be at least 40 years of age, to have earned above a specified salary in the last job, and to be able to provide a number of character references.) The senior nonprofit employment offices attract people seeking part-time or temporary post-retirement jobs. The older applicants to the State Employment Service offices represent all groups, especially those seeking full-time work in other than professional or managerial occupations.

Most respondents who had contacted employers as part of their job search felt that at least one employer was not willing to consider them for a job solely because of their age. However, the responses to interview questions suggest that the allegation of age discrimination would be difficult to prove in most instances, since rarely was it reported that the employer actually mentioned age as the reason for disqualifying the applicant.

The help wanted most by older job seekers was a source of job leads. Many wanted assistance in contacting employers. A minority chose to handle all employer contacts themselves.

Many persons also looked for understanding and personal attention--"someone I can talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers." Advice on how to deal with age discrimination was also desired.

Certain categories of respondents--women, long-term unemployed, and middle-aged job seekers--had special needs as revealed by the survey.

The majority of female job seekers surveyed were single, separated, divorced, or widowed. Women more often mentioned a need for job training. This greater need for training reflects the difficulties some women experience in reentering the labor force as a full-time, paid worker after years of being a homemaker and/or a part-time worker.

Among the long-term unemployed (those out of work and searching for a job for more than six months), many lack confidence in their ability to find a job, feeling they are victims of age discrimination.

Job seekers aged 55 to 64 reported more urgent and pressing employment problems than those 65 or older. They wanted more kinds of help from the employment office they visited, and they were more often dissatisfied with the help they did receive. Also, they were most often looking for full-time work, and they were more likely to report that their continued unemployment would pose a great hardship for their families.

Study of Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices for Older Job Seekers

Nationwide, there are more than 80 voluntary nonprofit employment offices that assist older people in finding jobs. Most of these offices were established in the last decade. They are "voluntary" because, unlike the State Employment Service, they are not required by law; they are "nonprofit" because no fee is charged for services. Each of the offices operate independently of one another.

Senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding 40 plus clubs) most commonly list openings for service, household, or clerical positions. Their services lead directly to job referral and placement. The burden of job search and placement is borne by the employment office staff, not the applicants. They are referred to openings after both employer and applicant have been screened by the employment office staff.

Our study showed that applicants to senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding 40 plus applicants) typically felt that the office they visited met some needs well. In particular, the office provided (1) someone to find and contact employers, (2) someone to talk with who understands personal problems of older job seekers, and (3) help in deciding the kind of work to look for. Many respondents felt that the nonprofit office visited failed to meet adequately certain of their needs, especially information or advice on job training, information on job opportunities in other towns, and advice on dealing with age discrimination.

Senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding 40 Plus) tend to be small-scale operations. On the average, a senior office has one new applicant each day the office is open. For the offices studied, the number of new applicants per month ranged from 5 to over 400.

The budget of the office has only a slight relationship to the number of people served by the office. It ranges from no funds at all to more than a million dollars a year. The average budget is about $2[illegible],000 a year, with the most frequent source of funds being the Federal, state or local government. A sizable minority of the offices surveyed receive the bulk of their financial support from private sources (e.g., United Way, YMCA, business contributions), which tend to impose certain conditions on the operation of the office. Most senior offices depend at least in part on unpaid volunteers to run the office.

With few exceptions, senior nonprofit employment offices do not have close ties with the State Employment Service. For only a few senior offices are referrals often received from the State Employment Service local office, and senior offices seldom refer people to the State Employment Office. There is an infrequent exchange of job listings or other information between the senior offices and State Employment Service offices. Three of the senior nonprofit offices surveyed (one Forty Plus and two other offices) have been given desks, telephones, and other support by a local State Employment Service office. In these instances, there is a close working relationship between the senior office and the State Employment Office.

On nearly every dimension, the operation of Forty Plus organizations contradict the operation of other senior nonprofit employment offices in general. The homogeniety of Forty Plus membership is assured by strict admission policies that screen out all those job seekers who have not held well paid, white-collar positions. There are no staff members to place Forty Plus members in jobs. Rather, the members coach each other on how to conduct a fruitful job search. Applicants are trained to "sell" their unique combination of experience and skills to employers.

State Employment Service Assistance to Older Workers

In State Employment Service offices, the placement rate for applicants 55 or older is far below that for SES applicants in general. Discussions with officials at State Employment Security Agencies and at DOL regional offices showed that the current level of effort devoted to older workers is low in most states. Part-time older worker specialists have been appointed in some local offices, but little is being done to train them or to monitor or evaluate their work in behalf of older applicants.

Older worker supervisors of SESAs explain the lower rate of placement of older workers by arguing that the older workers are harder to place than their younger counterparts. Also, since the management of the State Employment Service rewards number of placements made, the Employment Office staff prefers to assist younger workers. The analysis of statistics collected through the Employment Service Automated Recording System discloses that older workers are less likely to get services at the Employment Office than are younger applicants. However, when referred to a job, the older worker was just as likely to be hired as his younger counterpart, according to ESARS statistics.

Recently, assistance for older workers at some local State Employment Service offices has been increased by using older worker specialists paid under Title IX funds or CETA funds. A major effort of this kind is Project RENEW, under which 75 low-income older workers were hired, trained, and placed in Employment Service local offices in five states to work solely with older applicants. The RENEW older worker specialist positions were staffed by NRTA/AARP using their Title IX funds, and supervision was provided by the State Employment Service staff. The task of implementing the program and providing guidance and coordination was managed by the Preretirement Planning Center under a Department of Labor grant.

The achievements of Project RENEW have been impressive; consequently, the program is to be expanded to some additional states. From our review of the operations of Project RENEW, we can forecast that difficulties inherent in operating an expanded program will likely render it much less effective than it has been during its pilot phase. The difficulties we foresee are:

- Increasing resistance by SESA officials to the program. (Project RENEW coordinators report difficulties in persuading some Employment Service managers to accept RENEW workers within their offices, citing space limitations and time required to supervise them.)

- An inadequate pool of talent from which to select RENEW older worker specialists given the Title IX eligibility criteria. (RENEW workers are typically highly educated and are experienced in office and administrative work.)

- Preempting the time of the RENEW older worker specialists for employment office assignments not related to older workers. (This was a problem during the pilot program.)

- The success of RENEW in each state will reflect the priority the various SESAs have assigned to serving older workers (assuming that the planning, training and monitoring functions now carried out by Preretirement Planning Center are turned over to the individual State Employment Security Agencies).

The Role in Employment of the State Office on Aging

The role of the State Office on Aging in employment matters has been undergoing change during the last year. In 1977, 29 State Offices on Aging took charge of Title IX funds allotted to governors of states. In many instances this was the first time the SOA had devoted significant amounts of attention to older workers.

This year, the Administration on Aging issued the first detailed guidance to State Offices concerning employment services for older workers, the Handbook on Employment Services to the Elderly.

While the Older Americans Act was being considered for reauthorization by Congress, alternative plans for administering Title IX programs were being debated, with some recommending a much expanded role for the AoA and the State Offices on Aging.

Plans by State Offices on Aging regarding employment of older workers focus mainly on activities related to management of the Title IX Senior Community Service Employment Program, including developing interagency agreements, providing technical assistance to area agencies, and monitoring area agency activities in the area of employment. Some State Offices are planning to promote employment of older people in other ways, most often by lobbying in behalf of older workers to influence legislation, making improvements in existing employment services for older people, and by providing employment for older people within the Office on Aging netowrk.

A significant number of the annual plans which were analyzed for this study made little or no mention of any activities regarding employment. These were mostly the plans of state offices which were not administering Title IX funds, but some of the states receiving Title IX funds reported no plans regarding employment.

We identified some outstanding activities in behalf of older workers during visits to several State Offices on Aging. These activities are discussed in the full report in sections dealing with the Virginia and California long-range plans on aging, the Washington State survey of older persons' need for service, the New York State workshop on employment of the elderly, and the Iowa employment projects for older persons (training older people to serve as older worker specialists in State Employment Service local offices, using older persons to conduct surveys of pesticides and water supplies).

The Handbook on Employment Services to the Elderly recently issued by AoA to state and area agencies, describes the recommended employment assistance activities. These include: program development, advocacy, locating sources of funding, monitoring and assessment, training and technical assistance. Comparison of the recommended role to the planned activities of the State Offices on Aging indicates that few State Offices approximate the recommended activities. Most likely to be lacking are plans related to program development, assessment, and training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of research on older workers--both from the Project OLDER WORKER study and from other recent investigations--four recommendations concerning needed improvements in employment assistance for older job seekers are offered:

1. Provide additional assistance to older job seekers through the State Employment Security Agencies.

2. Promote the use of the State Offices on Aging as centers for planning and coordinating employment services for older workers.

3. Help senior nonprofit employment offices increase their effectiveness.

4. Evaluate the impact of Title IX and CETA on increasing employment opportunities.

Suggestions as to how to implement these general recommendations are discussed in the full report.

Chapter 1

Introduction

We are no longer a nation of youth. Men and women of the war baby boom of the Forties are well along the road to middle age, while the nation's birth rate is declining. The result is a steady upward shift in the mean age of the population. Today, 23 million Americans (about one out of ten) are 65 or over. And according to some estimates, one out of three Americans will be in that age group by the year 2000.

The long-neglected needs of older Americans are becoming acute as increasing numbers of citizens enter this age group. Nowhere is this more obvious than in the area of income security. A significant proportion of older Americans live on fixed incomes. Many live at or below the poverty level, while inflation erodes the relative value of their income even further. Those who wish to continue working beyond age 65, and those who try to return to the labor force after retiring, face the ever-present obstacle of age discrimination in all its subtle forms.

In recognition of the problems of the country's older citizens, the Congress, in 1965, passed the Older Americans Act "to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons..." Two of the ten objectives listed in the Act are (1) to assure older Americans "an adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living," and (2) to guarantee them "opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age."

The Older Americans Act also established the Administration on Aging (AoA) which was charged with carrying out the provisions of the Act. Among the responsibilities assigned to the AoA were (1) "to stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging," and (2) "to coordinate, and assist in, the planning and development by public (including Federal, State, and local agencies) and nonprofit private organizations of programs for older persons with a view to the establishment of a nationwide network of comprehensive, coordinated services and opportunities for such persons."

In October, 1976, the Administration on Aging awarded a grant to the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) to conduct a study of the employment needs of older workers, and an assessment of public and private employment assistance programs available to them. The study bears directly on the above-listed responsibilities of the AoA, and on the two objectives of the Older Americans Act which relate to income security. The research comprised four component substudies:

- A nationwide survey of older job seekers.
- An analysis of voluntary, nonprofit employment offices for older workers.
- An examination of several State Units on Aging to determine their role in facilitating the employment of older job seekers.

- An analysis of the services for older applicants provided by Offices of State Employment Security Agencies, and the means for augmenting these services.

This report describes the results of these studies.

REVIEW OF INFORMATION ON THE EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND NEEDS OF OLDER JOB SEEKERS

To provide a foundation for the HumRRO research, a review of published information on older workers was conducted to determine (1) the employment characteristics and needs of older workers and (2) the job market for older workers. The conclusions resulting from this literature review are listed below; the bibliography appears elsewhere in this report.

Age and Job Discrimination

Discrimination by employers against workers solely because of age is widespread. The statement, "Most employers discriminate against older people and make it difficult for them to find jobs," was agreed to by almost all (87%) of a national sample of people who have hiring and firing responsibility (Louis Harris Associates, 1975). A number of case studies of displaced workers (Haber, Ferman, and Hudson, 1963) showed less favorable treatment by employers of the older compared to the younger job seeker. Wachtel (1965) found from a multivariate analysis of data collected on hard core unemployed, that age was the fourth-ranking variable among eight variables in accounting for employment status.

Sheppard (1971) examined several studies on job seeking by older workers. He concluded that their greater difficulty in finding jobs, compared to younger workers, cannot be attributed in large part to factors such as differences in education and skill. Rather, age itself is a major factor in accounting for employment difficulties. Some studies cited by Sheppard indicated that even among older manual workers with above average educations, chances of re-employment after having lost a regular job are no better than among those with less education.

Job Performance of Older Workers

Older workers generally perform as well as younger workers as judged by overall job productivity, number of job-related accidents, work capacity, and ability to learn. Studies comparing the job productivity and performance of older and younger workers usually find a slight positive relationship to age or none at all (McFarland and O'Dougherty, 1959). A 1972 survey of employees of New York State agencies showed that the performance of those 65 to 70 years of age was judged about equal to and sometimes noticeably better than that of younger workers.

Data on age and accidents show that accidents preventable by judgment decrease with age. (Those involving quick evasive action tend to increase with age.) Work capacity is found to be little affected by age for tasks with light or moderate physical demands. The research on learning as related to age indicates there is little change in primary learning ability with age, when differences in motivation and physiological state are taken into account (Birren, 1964).

Discouraged Older Job Seekers

Older job seekers are more likely to become discouraged and to withdraw from the labor force. The lower rate of participation of older persons in the labor force is clearly noted in the statistics furnished in the Manpower Report of the President (U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975). Other analyses published regularly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) show that among individuals who have no job and are not looking for work, a higher proportion of older persons say their reason for not seeking work is that they can't find a job. Wilson, Richards, and Bercini (1975) found that among disabled veterans, older disabled veterans were more likely to have given up the job search.

The official unemployment statistics greatly understate the employment problems of older workers. The official unemployment rates as calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics leave out discouraged workers -- those who have given up actively looking for work. The unemployed are defined as those out of work and actively searching for a job. BLS data show that older persons are vastly overrepresented among discouraged workers compared to other age groups. Many discouraged workers want and need work (Rosenblum, 1976) but have given up actively looking for it.

Duration of Unemployment

Compared to younger workers, older workers who are out of a job tend to remain unemployed longer, a conclusion repeatedly demonstrated by employment statistics (for example, Manpower Report of the President, 1975). Older job seekers compose a disproportionately large segment of those who have used up their unemployment compensation benefits. A 1975 Department of Labor study showed that about 70% of those exhausting unemployment payments were age 45 or older.

Long-term job loss of older workers is associated not only with loss of confidence but also with increase in health problems. Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey on the employment experience of middle-aged men, Parnes and King (1977) compared two groups: (1) men who worked at least five years, then lost their jobs and remained jobless for several years; with (2) a matched group who had not lost their jobs. They found that those without work for several years, compared to the control group, experienced a sense of powerlessness and loss of confidence. Their health was more likely to deteriorate. Cobb and Lasl (1972) found rises in blood pressure among those who remained unemployed after a plant shutdown. They report that the increase in blood pressure in the long-term unemployed were of the order of magnitude of change which results from 10 years of aging.

Retirement and Need for Work

Many older persons want and need to continue working after retirement. One reason is that many older workers are forced to retire before they are ready to quit working. About half of those studied by Palmore (1964) said they were retired by their employer's decision. A Louis Harris National Poll (1975) showed that about half of those who were retired did not look forward to stopping work. This poll indicated that some elderly individuals felt they had unused job skills, and some even had interest in job training. Some older persons are interested in second careers (Sheppard, 1971).

Many retired people have a need for the extra income from working (Brennan, 1967), (Butler, 1975), (Kreps, 1969), (Morse, 1969). It is estimated that at least one-quarter of the people in the U.S. who are 65 or older have incomes below the poverty level. The majority of those in this age group depend on Social Security for all or most of their income. (The average Social Security payment is only slightly above the poverty level.) The single elderly woman is especially likely to be living at or below the poverty level. The National Senior Citizens Law Center (1975) shows that over half of this group have incomes at this level.

JOB MARKET FOR OLDER WORKERS

In comparison with younger workers, the patterns of employment for older workers that are consistently seen are (1) a higher concentration in managerial, sales, and service occupations; (2) a greater percentage in part-time and temporary work; and (3) a lower overall rate of participation in the labor force (Axelbank, 1969), (Louis Harris and Associates, 1975), (Morse, 1969), (U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1975), (Wirtz, 1965).

A number of factors account for the observed pattern of employment of older workers:

- Pension plans tend to reduce the labor force participation of older workers (Taggart, 1973), (Clague, et.al., 1971).

- Some older people develop physical conditions that limit their ability to carry out certain kinds of physically demanding work. However, it is often possible, with job or work station redesign, to enable the aging worker to function productively (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1969), (Wilson, Richards, and Bercini, 1975).

- Some employers have erroneous beliefs about the older workers' productive capacities (National Council on Aging, 1966), (Leiter, 1968), (Work Place Standards Administration, 1970).

- Some employers are concerned that older workers will have higher salary requirements than younger workers (Brennan, 1967).

- Older workers tend to be concentrated in the industries in which the greatest number of part-time or temporary jobs are found (Morse, 1969).

- Skill obsolescence is a factor in the unemployment of some older workers. However, retraining older workers is feasible. (Jaffee, 1969), (Sheppard, 1971), (National Council on Aging, 1966).

EMPLOYMENT SERVICES TO OLDER JOB SEEKERS

A number of organizations and agencies are concerned with providing employment help to older persons. These organizations include the State Employment Service, various voluntary employment services, professional and trade associations, labor unions, and community service job programs.

Several major changes in employment programs affecting older workers have occurred in the last decade:

1. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 requires ability rather than age to be the determining factor in employer decisions. The Act currently covers those 40 to 65 years of age.

2. There has been a de-emphasis in the State Employment Service older worker program.

3. The number of voluntary employment services offering special help to elderly job seekers now totals more than 80 agencies.

4. Senior Community Service Employment Programs derived from Title IX of the Older Americans Act, have been developed.

5. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) legislation, passed in 1973, established a manpower program for all ages, operated by local prime sponsors in each state. (People 55 and older are underrepresented in CETA training and job programs compared to their numbers in the unemployed population. However, more older persons have obtained employment in CETA jobs than have been assisted through the Title IX program.)

Economic programs for older workers have undergone some further major changes in the last year, when this research was in progress, as described in the next section.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN OLDER WORKER LEGISLATION

While this study was in progress, three major developments occurred in legislation affecting older workers:

- Funds for Senior Community Service Employment Programs (Title IX) were given a significant boost, and for the first time states were allocated a percentage of the funds for the development of their own Title IX programs.

- The Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216) raised the earnings limitation for Social Security recipients.

- Congress passed and the President signed into law an amendment to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967, which will curb mandatory retirement practices.

This was a banner year for Senior Community Service Employment Programs. The initial $90 million appropriation for FY 77 Title IX programs was increased by $60 million as authorized in the Economic Stimulus Appropriation Act. The $150 million funding level significantly increased the capacity of Senior Community Service Employment Programs to serve older Americans. It provided employment for 37,400 older workers. Further, this year's Departments of Labor HEW appropriations bill authorized more than $190 million for Title IX programs, a sum that will provide 47,500 jobs. Another $30 million may soon be added to this year's appropriation to compensate for the increase in minimum wage, if a Department of Labor request is approved.

Congress and the Administration are clearly signaling their interest in older worker programs. Since 1973, funds for Title IX have grown exponentially from an initial funding of $10 million to the current level of $190 million, an increase of 1,900%.

With the generous Title IX appropriation in FY 77 came a change in the allocation formula. For the first time, states were given a portion (20%) of the Title IX funds for the development of their own employment programs for older workers. This move was opposed by most National Title IX contractors, and it has had the unfortunate effect of straining relations between the National Contractors and the State Units on Aging. (The National Title IX Contractors are: Green Thumb of the National Farmers Union, National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons, National Council on Aging, National Council of Senior Citizens, and U.S. Forest Service.) Some Title IX contractors feel that the State Units are not capable of efficiently administering Title IX programs, citing the fact that it would be hard for them to hold their administrative costs down. Also, questions have been raised as to whether the involvement of State Units on Aging isn't a violation of Title III of the Older Americans Act. In that title, State Units and Area Agencies are prohibited from providing direct services unless this is necessary to assure an adequate supply of the service. It is a matter of interpretation as to whether developing and administering subsidized employment programs for older workers actually amount to the direct provision of services and if so, whether the involvement of State Units is needed to assure adequate service.

Relations between the National Title IX contractors and State Units on Aging have been strained further by the fact that Congress has been weighing the merits of transferring control of the Title IX program from the Department of Labor to the Administration on Aging, a move supported by the National Association of State Units on Aging. These issues will have to be resolved by the Congress before May of this year (1978) when it must vote on a measure to reauthorize the Older Americans Act.

The Social Security Amendments of 1977 carried good news for older Americans who wish to work part-time to supplement their Social Security income. The earnings limitation for Social Security recipients was raised from $3,000 per year to $4,000 per year for 1978, with an additional raise of $500 per year, until the limitation reaches $6,000 in 1982. Starting in 1982, there will be no limit on the earnings of workers 70 years of age or older.

A significant problem mentioned by many of the older workers interviewed during this study was the severe restriction on employment options imposed by the limit on earnings. The adjusted ceilings created by the 1977 amendments, though not as liberal as many would have liked, will certainly improve the employment alternatives of those drawing Social Security benefits.

Mandatory retirement, for years the bane of older people who wish to continue working, started on its way to obsolescence recently when Congress passed a bill to virtually abolish it for Federal workers, and to increase minimum permissible mandatory retirement age from 65 to 70 for the private sector. Mandatory retirement, or "forced unemployment," as Florida's Representative Claude Pepper, champion of the bill, likes to call it, has long been the target of senior citizen organizations. The bill amends the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.

The measure has been signed into law by the President. It could be the most significant piece of legislation for older workers since the original bill was passed in 1967. It is hoped that the total abolition of mandatory retirement for Federal employees will serve as a model for private industry.

OVERVIEW

The survey methods are described in Chapter 2 with data collection instruments presented in Appendix A. The following is a list of the topics covered in the surveys, with the chapter in which they are discussed indicated:

- Reasons why older people are looking for employment (Chapter 3).
- Help older job seekers want from employment offices, and their evaluation of help they have received (Chapter 3).
- Distinguishing characteristics of long-term unemployed older people (Chapter 3).
- Employer age discrimination as experienced by older job applicants (Chapter 3).
- Kind of jobs wanted by various older job seekers (Chapter 3).
- Structure of senior nonprofit employment offices: funding, budgets, staffing, etc. (Chapter 4).
- Kinds of jobs available through senior nonprofit employment offices and the services provided to applicants (Chapter 4).

- Relationship of senior nonprofit offices to the State Employment Service (Chapter 4).
- Successful senior nonprofit employment offices and their service delivery models (Chapter 4).
- Employment role of the Regional Office on Aging (Chapter 6).
- Manpower activities currently engaged in by various State Units on Aging and activities being planned for the future (Chapter 6).
- Some outstanding activities of State Units on Aging in behalf of older workers (Chapter 6).
- Two models for augmenting State Employment Service help to older applicants (Chapter 5).
- Discussion of the results of the surveys and recommendations for action in behalf of older job seekers (Chapter 7).

Chapter 2

Methodology

OVERVIEW

The analysis presented in this report of employment services available to older job seekers is based on the information gathered in three substudies:

- A survey of older job seekers.
- A study of voluntary senior nonprofit employment offices specializing in job placement for the elderly.[1]
- A study of the roles of state and regional offices on aging and Department of Labor in employment programs for older persons.

Survey of Older Job Seekers

Survey packets on the employment needs and problems of older workers were distributed to nearly 4,700 elderly job seekers across the nation. The survey was conducted through 52 local offices of State Employment Security Agencies (SESA) and 53 voluntary nonprofit organizations specializing in job placement for the elderly. Employment offices that assisted in the survey were asked to distribute survey packets to all job applicants 55 years and older during a specified time period. Some job seekers in the 40 to 54 age range were also surveyed since several senior nonprofit employment offices serve unemployed middle-aged workers as well. The four-page questionnaire was self-administering and anonymous. Participation was voluntary. Completed survey forms were mailed back to HumRRO by the job seekers. A total of 1,256 usable returns was received, 1,052 from job seekers 55 and older.

Fifty-one in-depth telephone interviews were conducted with a subsample of older job seekers who had responded to the main survey and who had volunteered their names and telephone numbers for the purpose.

The objectives of the interviews were (1) to study more closely the needs and experiences of older job seekers with severe employment problems (that is, unemployed persons who needed a job in order to manage financially); and (2) to obtain the job seekers' evaluations of the help they received from senior nonprofit versus public (SESA) employment offices.

Study of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

The first phase of this study consisted of a mail survey of the senior nonprofit employment offices specializing in job placement services for the elderly. The offices were identified in the National Directory of Employment Resources for the Middle-Aged and Retired (1976). The purpose of the survey was to gather comprehensive data on the operation of senior nonprofit employment offices--their structure, the services offered, characteristics of the job applicants, and the kinds of jobs listed. From the 82 offices listed in the directory, nine directors were interviewed, and 73 were surveyed by mail. The data analysis is based on the responses of 60 offices.

---

[1] This type of employment office will, in this report, be generally referred to as a "senior nonprofit employment office" to distinguish it from the state or public employment service offices (SESA offices) which serve all groups. The senior nonprofit employment office is not required by law, whereas the SESA offices are mandated by Federal legislation.

In the second phase, project researchers visited a number of offices to interview staff members and to learn by observation how the offices functioned. The offices were chosen so that a diversity of client groups and approaches to serving the older job seeker would be represented.

Study of State and Regional Offices on Aging

The focus of this study was on the role of the state and regional offices on aging in regard to employment of older persons and the nature of the interactions among these offices and the regional offices of the U.S. Department of Labor and the State Employment Security Agencies. Project researchers conducted interviews with representatives of six regional offices (Aging and Labor) and 10 state offices (Aging and Employment Security). Selection of states was made so that most regions would be represented. In addition, several states were included where Project RENEW was operating. (Project RENEW is a five-state demonstration project in which older people are trained to work in public employment offices to assist older applicants.)

JOB SEEKER SURVEY

Purpose

Survey packets were distributed to 4,700 older job seekers applying to public and senior nonprofit employment offices for the elderly across the country. The purpose of the survey was to gather data on the employment goals and problems of older people and the services they need and receive.

The Sample

Selection of Job Seekers

The population of job seekers to be studied included (1) persons 55 years and older applying to selected senior nonprofit and SESA (public) employment offices, and (2) persons 40-65, who were active members of Forty Plus organizations.

The period of job application was defined as March-May, 1977. No demographic variables were specified for the population other than age. Job seeker status was assumed by definition.

Job seekers were selected in a two-stage process. The first stage required the selection of employment offices that would distribute the survey questionnaire; the second stage involved the selection of the individual applicants at each distribution point.

Selection of Employment Offices

Three types of employment offices assisted in the conduct of the study:

1. Senior nonprofit employment offices specializing in job placement services for the elderly.

2. State Employment Security Agency (SESA) local offices (or "public" employment offices) serving all job seekers.

3. "Forty Plus" organizations, a group of nonprofit employment agencies specializing in the counseling and placement of unemployed professionals or administrators whose previous salaries exceeded a certain amount.

Originally, the project methodology called for distribution of surveys through senior nonprofit employment offices only. After the study began, however, the Department of Labor agreed to assist by allowing the participation of some local SESA offices. A matching plan was devised by which pairs of senior nonprofit and public employment offices would distribute the questionnaires. For each nonprofit office in the sample, a public office would be selected that served the same type of applicant and was located closest to the nonprofit office. However, this plan did not prove to be feasible when it became evident that both members of an assigned pair could not always be counted on to participate. Nonetheless, the inclusion of public employment offices in the study permitted wider distribution of the survey to a more representative sample of older job seekers and provided the information for comparisons between the job applicants at the senior nonprofit and the public offices.

Selection of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

The original plan provided for the selection of a random sample of 40 of the 82 senior nonprofit employment offices listed in the *Employment Resources Directory*. But in the earlier survey of directors of these offices (described later) some offices reported a very low flow of applicants, and others did not respond to the survey at all. The plan was revised so that all offices that responded to the previous survey and that reported eight or more new applicants a month were asked to distribute the survey packet to job seekers. Three offices that had taken part in a pilot test of the survey procedures were not asked to distribute survey packets in the main job seeker survey. Fifty-three of the 58 offices that were asked to participate agreed to do so. (See Appendix A for the letter requesting cooperation with the survey.)

Selection of SESA Local Offices

After the support of the Department of Labor was obtained, a group of local offices was identified according to the matching plan. Changes in office locations and functions caused many deletions and substitutions to the list. Altogether, 52 offices in nine Federal regions cooperated with the study. Each office was informed about Project OLDER WORKER through U.S. Department of Labor and SESA channels.

Procedures

Description of the Survey Packet

The survey packet, designed to be self-explanatory, consisted of: (1) an outer envelope describing sponsorship of the study and the general content of the questionnaire, (2) a letter to the job applicant describing the purpose of the study, (3) the questionnaire, and (4) a postage-paid return envelope. (Each of the components of the survey packet are included in Appendix A.)

Job seekers could learn the details of the survey in three ways: (1) from information on the outside of the survey packet, (2) from the letter enclosed in the packet, (3) from information provided by employment office personnel handing out the survey packets.

Employment office personnel were instructed to tell applicants that the survey was government-sponsored, voluntary, and anonymous, and that further information could be found inside the survey packet. (See Appendix A for the instructions sent to directors of senior nonprofit offices and managers of SESA local offices.)

Distribution of Survey Packet

Offices were sent sufficient survey packets for an estimated one month's new job applicants. They were asked to distribute packets until the supply was exhausted or until notified by HumRRO to halt distribution. To avoid introducing biases, participating offices were asked to distribute the survey packets to all older job seekers coming to those offices during the survey period. At the public employment offices it was necessary to determine if the applicant met the age requirement of 55 years or older. The senior nonprofit offices were asked to give the survey packets to all new applicants since most were assumed to meet the age criterion.

Because of their unique structure, a different distribution procedure was possible at Forty Plus organizations. At a weekly meeting attended by active members (those still looking for work), the directors of cooperating offices introduced the survey and then distributed the survey packets. Questionnaires reached all active members at about the same time. If they were not present at the introductory meeting, the survey packet was deposited in their mail slot. Since it was not feasible to restrict distribution to active members 55 or older, questionnaires were given out to all active members. (While the public and senior nonprofit employment offices also maintained a file of active applicants [those they believe were still unemployed], there was no practible mechanism for identifying and reaching all of these job seekers.)

In order for the voluntary and anonymous nature of the survey to be preserved, offices were not asked to take the names of the job applicants who received survey packets. As a result, following up respondents was not possible. Cooperating offices merely had to maintain a record of the numbers of survey packets distributed.

Completion of the Questionnaire

Questionnaires could be completed by applicants in the employment office itself or at the applicants' convenience. It was not possible to require the completion of questionnaires in the office since many offices lacked the necessary facilities. A condition of participation by senior nonprofit employment offices was that distribution of the survey could not interfere with office routine. Some offices offered to assist older applicants who might have difficulty in filling out the questionnaire, but the majority of offices simply handed out survey packets with a brief explanation.

Questionnaire Topics

Items on the questionnaire concerned the following subjects:

- Nature of most recent job.
- Current employment status.
- Reason for leaving most recent job.
- Reason for current job search.
- Kinds of employment help needed from employment offices and satisfaction with help received.
- Necessity of receiving income from a job.
- Nature of job sought and the restrictions placed on it.
- Demographic information.

Response Rate

Since participating offices kept a record of how many survey packets were given to older job seekers, a response rate could be calculated. Table 2.1 shows the percentage of returns for each of the three types of offices handing out questionnaires, and for all offices together.

With the exception of Forty Plus organizations, employment offices were to have distributed questionnaires only to applicants age 55 and older. Some younger job seekers, though, were included among respondents. A total of 204 respondents either failed to specify their age (N=26) or reported that they were younger than 55.

SESA Offices	45
Senior Nonprofit Offices (excluding Forty Plus)	19
Forty Plus Offices	140
	204

These 204 respondents were deleted from the sample, thus leaving 1,052 job seekers age 55 and over.

Table 2.1

Number of Survey Packets Sent, Distributed, and Returned for Three Types of Employment Offices

	No. of Survey Packets Sent to Offices	No. of Survey Packets Distributed[a]	No.[b] & Percent Returned	
SESA (N=52)	2620	2365	665	(28%)
Senior Nonprofit[c] (N=45)	3217	1915	370	(19%)
Forty Plus (N=6)	595	435	221	(51%)
Total	6432	4715	1256	(27%)

---

a) As reported by employment offices.

b) Usable returns only. Thirty-seven more questionnaires were received, 11 were too late for analysis, and 26 were rejected because many items were unanswered.

c) Excluding Forty Plus organizations.

It is obvious from the statistics shown in Table 2.1, that response rate varied with office type. The higher rate of return from Forty Plus offices reflects the more efficient distribution procedure and the higher socioeconomic status of its members. To achieve a response rate of more than 50% with no followup is evidence of the relevance of the survey topics to the respondents. At Forty Plus organizations, members form committees to help other members in each phase of their job search. As a result of their self-help approach, many Forty Plus members regarded themselves as experts who could give Project researchers valuable insights on the employment of the aging executive or professional.

The response rates from the other employment offices, particularly the senior nonprofit offices, were lower than anticipated. The distribution of questionnaires through local State Employment Security Agency offices was arranged through the Department of Labor in Washington and at the regional level, so that local offices may have felt under official obligation to comply fully with the instructions concerning Project OLDER WORKER. Directors of senior nonprofit offices, on the other hand, could act independently. However, it is likely that the rates shown above are underestimates of the true rate. Many senior nonprofit offices greatly overestimated the numbers of survey packets they would hand out in one month. It is probable that some offices inflated their reports on the quantity of surveys given out so that it would not appear as though they had failed to cooperate or to meet their quota. Several offices expressed embarrassment at their inability to meet their original estimates even though they were asked only to distribute what they could. In addition, a few offices that claimed to have distributed substantial numbers of surveys, were not represented proportionately in the returns. Table 2.2 gives information on five senior nonprofit offices that returned no surveys at all or returned only one.

Table 2.2

Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices Returning One Survey or None

Office	No. of Surveys Requested	No. Reported Handed Out	No. Returned
1.	200	120	1
2.	105	48	1
3.	75	25	1
4.	35	35	0
5.	25	25	0

Even with an overall response rate of 19 percent (for senior nonprofit offices) the probability that there would be only one return from an office claiming to have handed out 25 survey packets (to take the smallest number), is exceedingly small.

With the exception of Forty Plus organizations, response rates within office types varied enormously. Table 2.3 presents a distribution of these rates. The rates are far more variable than would be expected from the binomial distribution using the average rate of return for each type of office as the probability of a questionnaire being returned. From the binomial distribution it would be expected that for senior nonprofit employment offices, 95% of the return rates would be between 6% and 32%, and for the public employment offices, 95% of the return rates between 15% and 41%.

A major reason for the varying response rates is the likely inflation of the number of survey packets handed out. A second probable cause is differences in the way offices introduced the survey to older applicants. Although all offices received identical instructions, the manner in which office personnel handed the packet to the client would influence the chances of a response. An interviewer who felt the survey to be an unnecessary nuisance could easily communicate this opinion. A half-hearted or even derogatory presentation of the survey packet may have been enough to convince many older job seekers that compliance would be a waste of time. On the other hand, it was learned that the staff of a few senior nonprofit offices was willing to assist respondents in completing the questionnaire.

Table 2.3

Response Rates for Public (SESA), Senior Nonprofit, and Forty Plus Employment Offices

Return Rate (%)	SESA (N=52)	Senior Nonprofit[a] (N=44)	Forty Plus (N=6)
70 and over	2	7	17
60-69	10	5	17
50-59		11	34
40-49	18	7	17
30-39	33	9	17
20-29	21	16	
10-19	18	20	
0-9		27	

---

a) Excluding Forty Plus organizations.

Problems Encountered in Conduct of Survey and Countermeasures Taken

While distribution of questionnaires through public and senior nonprofit employment offices permitted an economical, practical, and ethically acceptable means of reaching older job seekers, it did not permit the research staff to exercise complete control over the survey procedures. As discussed previously, many offices were not able to distribute as many questionnaires as they had predicted. Three offices reported that because of internal crises they could distribute none. Also, there is evidence that offices varied in their endorsement of the survey to applicants, depressing the response rate in some instances.

During the survey's pretesting phase, the Project staff became aware of these difficulties and attempted to rectify them within the framework of the Project. A standardized explanation of the survey, to be read to older job seekers, was tested in various employment offices. However, because it was rarely used in practice, this approach was abandoned in favor of one in which the essential information was printed prominently on the outside of the survey packet. This insured that potential respondents received the same information. At the same time, it reduced the burden of explanation for employment office staff.

When several senior nonprofit offices were contacted in the pilot phase of the survey to secure their cooperation for the questionnaire's pretesting, another problem arose. Some office directors made it clear that they resented Project

OLDER WORKER's Federal funding for research on employment of the elderly when they themselves had barely enough funding to support employment services for the elderly. They questioned how the research could benefit them, directly or indirectly. In order to help satisfy this legitimate concern, senior nonprofit offices in the main study were offered a summary of the responses of applicants to their particular offices and for all offices combined. In this way, the survey results could provide useful feedback to the employment staff on their services to older job seekers.

A third difficulty involved the survey instrument itself. Upon completion of the distribution of the survey packet, several staff members in employment offices commented that their applicants may have found the questionnaire too long and complicated. A major goal of the pretest was to design an instrument that achieved a suitable compromise between the demands of the complexity of the desired data and the demands for brevity and simplicity. Older job seekers of varied educational and occupational backgrounds were asked to complete the draft questionnaire themselves, then to submit to an interview on their reactions to it. The instrument was then revised: (1) It was set in large, easy-to-read type; (2) it consisted mainly of multiple choice, check-off items, with write-in responses intended to be brief; and (3) it could be completed in 15 minutes or less. A second pretest was conducted in which the questionnaire was distributed through employment offices. The returns indicated where final revisions were needed.

Of the surveys returned in the main study, only 2% could not be used because of insufficient or confused answers. Yet approximately 28% of the respondents had less than a high school education. About half of those excluded were respondents who failed to answer any of the 14 questions on job sought while answering other questions. These respondents were probably not looking for work. The extent to which the questionnaire overwhelmed nonrespondents is unknown, but virtually all respondents could understand it.

A final problem was considered to be the suspicions that some older persons have about "outside" interference in their lives. Several employment office directors advised they had to work especially hard with the low income job seekers to overcome their automatic distrust of "officialdom." Partly for this reason, the survey was made anonymous except for those people who volunteered to be contacted for a follow-up interview. Assurance of anonymity may not have been enough for some employment service applicants who feared that their answers on income and satisfaction with services would jeopardize them in some way. The majority of respondents, however, did not find the survey threatening, since 66% volunteered their names and telephone numbers.

Confidentiality

The survey was entirely anonymous except for those respondents who chose to give their names and phone numbers for a follow-up interview. The research staff did not obtain lists of job seekers that employment offices had in their active files, nor did employment offices take the names of persons who were given the survey packet. Also, employment office personnel did not have access to survey responses unless the respondents chose to share their answers.

The data are stored on punched cards, with identification numbers that cannot be matched with the respondents' name (if provided). Participating senior nonprofit offices were sent a summary of the responses of their applicants, but no individual job seeker was identified.

Telephone Interviews with Job Seekers

Telephone interviews were conducted with a subsample of 51 older job seekers who volunteered their names and telephone numbers for this purpose on the questionnaire.

The Sample

The selection of the subsample was influenced by the special issues to be examined in the interviews. The job seekers chosen were:

1. Those who were unemployed at the time the main questionnaire was completed.
2. Those who reported that without a job, their families could manage with some difficulty or great difficulty. (One purpose of the interviews was to understand the employment needs and problems of older job seekers who had to work in order to support themselves.)
3. Those who were in one of two age groups: 65 years and over, and 55 to 59 years. (The first group represents post-retirement job seekers whose needs and problems may differ from the second group representing "old middle-aged" job seekers usually not yet eligible for pension or Social Security payments.)
4. Those who received their original questionnaire from a senior nonprofit employment office. (Another purpose of the interviews was to obtain job seekers' comparisons of the help they received from senior nonprofit employment offices versus public (SESA) offices.)

The subsample of 108 was further divided into four cells defined by age group and sex. The goal was to complete 50 interviews, filling each cell as shown below:

	Sex		
Age Group	Male	Female	
55-59	17	8	
65 and over	17	9*	
Total	34	17	51

* 1 extra interview was conducted.

Procedure

Job seekers were contacted by telephone and asked again if they were willing to be interviewed. If the respondent agreed, a 20-30 minute interview ensued, using a structured interview guide (See Appendix A). No difficulties were encountered.

Topics Covered in Interview

The interview explored the following subjects:

- Current employment status.
- Nature and reasons for any job shift.
- Evaluation of employment help received from senior nonprofit offices.
- Comparison with help received from SESA office (if applicable).
- Explanation of specific instances of age discrimination.

STUDY OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

The national study of senior nonprofit employment offices specializing in job placement services for the elderly was conducted in two parts: (1) a mail survey and (2) a series of in-depth studies of selected nonprofit offices.

Survey Sample

The sample of senior nonprofit offices consisted of all such entries in the National Directory of Employment Resources for the Middle-Aged and Retired, published by the Clearinghouse on Employment for the Aging (1976). The directory listed 82 local/voluntary/nonprofit organizations whose primary function was to supply employment counseling and placement services for senior job seekers. Included were nine Forty Plus organizations or "clubs" that cater to unemployed professionals, administrators, and managers whose previous salaries exceeded a designated amount.

Before the survey it was learned that one office was defunct. However, it was replaced by another which came to the attention of the research staff. Nine offices in the greater Washington, D.C. area participated in personal, pilot interviews so they were not resurveyed later.

Survey Procedures

The interviews mentioned above served both as an orientation to the entire study of older worker employment and as pretesting for the office survey instrument. A five-page questionnaire accompanied by an explanatory letter and project information sheet (see Appendix A) was sent to the directors of 73 senior nonprofit employment offices. A postage-paid, return envelope was included.

One month after the first mailing a second letter and questionnaire were sent to nonrespondents. Those offices that failed to respond to the second mailing were contacted by telephone to ascertain if they were still functioning as employment services for the elderly.

The questionnaire cover sheet requested that the survey be completed by the office director or another person thoroughly familiar with office operations. Since the purpose of the survey was to gain an understanding of the procedures and problems at senior nonprofit offices, the questions were quite detailed. However, most questions were multiple-choice or check-off so that the entire instrument could be completed in 30 minutes or less. Offices were also asked to send brochures, annual reports, application forms, or other readily available material that could give further insight into their operations.

Topics Covered in Questionnaire

The survey was divided into four main subject areas:

- Structure of the employment office (e.g., budget, number of staff).
- Characteristics of applicants.
- Kinds of jobs listed by employers and sought by applicants.
- Employers' attitudes towards older workers.
- Nature of services offered.
- Extent of dealings with the State Employment Security Agency.

Response Rate

Of the 73 questionnaires sent to the senior nonprofit offices, 57 (78%) were returned. The 16 "nonrespondents" were of several types:

- Eleven nonresponses from existing offices.
- Two letters of refusal to participate.
- Two offices no longer existing.
- One erroneous entry in the Employment Resources Directory. (The organization was not an employment service.)

From the mail survey, 54 usable, sufficiently complete responses were obtained. Two questionnaires contained very little information because the organizations were not actually job placement services. A third questionnaire was returned with a letter explaining that the office had recently closed. The pilot interviews yielded six cases suitable for analysis, giving a total of 60 valid cases (including seven Forty Plus organizations).

Problems Encountered and Countermeasures Taken

The response rate, although a respectable 78%, was not as high as expected. There are several reasonable explanations:

1. Directories, which may contain current information at the moment of publication, quickly become obsolete. The Employment Resources Directory contained entries for three defunct offices and three misclassified organizations that did not provide job placement services. Since the compilation of a new directory would have entailed an expensive research effort in itself, the existing directory offered an acceptable expedient.

2. Many senior nonprofit offices that receive Federal funds, are burdened with paper work. Since the survey was voluntary it could likely be neglected. During the pretesting the questionnaire was modified to reduce the burden for the respondent. Only summary or approximated information was requested so that office staff did not have to search its files or compile figures. Clearly a majority of office directors did not find the demands excessive, but a few of the nonrespondents may have misunderstood the intent of some of the items, as the two refusal letters indicated.

3. Apparently, the life of some senior nonprofit offices is short. Since completing the mail survey, several offices have advised that they have closed down. Undoubtedly, new ones have opened that were not surveyed. However, the survey results will be more than adequate to illustrate the fundamental similarities and differences in the operations of senior nonprofit offices.

Case Studies of Selected Senior Nonprofit Offices

Through interviews with office staff, attendance at conferences, and a variety of published materials, project researchers had the opportunity to study certain senior nonprofit employment offices in detail. Project researchers were able to visit several offices to interview the directors, job development specialists, intake interviewers and other staff members, and to observe a typical day at the employment office. Some office directors enclosed a wealth of written information with their mail questionnaires, and others made presentations about their offices at conferences on older worker employment. Brief case studies were written based on this detailed knowledge of certain senior nonprofit employment offices. The offices included some that are particularly successful or innovative as well as those that have experienced problems in providing services to the older job seeker. Offices that cater to special groups of mature job seekers and those with working relationships with government older worker programs were also included.

STUDY OF STATE AND REGIONAL OFFICES ON AGING AND DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR

The focus of this substudy was on the role of the state and regional offices on aging in regard to the employment of older persons and the nature of the interactions among these offices and the regional offices of the U.S. Department of Labor and the State Employment Security Agencies. Project researchers conducted interviews with representatives of regional and state offices, and in one state, the research staff attended a conference on employment of the aging.

Selection of Regional and State Offices

The offices visited formed a sample of convenience, rather than a probability sample. The selections were made according to the following considerations:

1. Most regions should be represented. (States in 9 of the ten regions were visited.)
2. Some of the states in which Project RENEW operates should be included. (Three of the five Project RENEW states were selected.)
3. When the regional staff of Department of Labor or Administration on Aging discouraged the visit to a state, that state would be excluded. (One state was excluded for this reason.)
4. Travel costs must not exceed the Project travel budget.

Regional Office Study

In six of the 10 Federal regions, Project staff met separately with representatives of the Regional Office on Aging and the Regional Department of Labor. In each case, the individual from each office most concerned with the employment of older people was present, and in some cases, the office director and other staff members also attended. The meetings took place in Region II (New York City), Region IV (Atlanta), Region V (Chicago), Region VI (Dallas), Region VIII (Denver), and Region X (Seattle).

The agenda, which was mailed to each office prior to the meeting, included (1) the role of the regional office regarding employment services to older workers within the region, (2) Title IX programs operating in the region and the use of Title IX monies going to the states, (3) outstanding employment programs for older workers within the region, and (4) interaction between the Department of Labor regional office and the Regional Office on Aging. Each meeting took from 45 minutes to two hours.

Some regional visits were made prior to the decision to grant Title IX funds to state governors (which could then assign funds to state agencies). These regions were contacted by mail and telephone to learn about the impact of Title IX funding on the state offices on aging, that is, which of the state offices on aging administered the Title IX state funds and the plans for using these funds.

State Office Study

Discussions on employment of older people also were held with representatives of the State Office of Aging and separately with the State Employment Security Agencies in Virginia, Delaware, New Jersey, Florida, Ohio, Texas, Iowa, Colorado, California, and Washington. The following topics were covered:

1. The role of the state office in overseeing and coordinating employment services for older persons.

2. The various employment services available to older persons within the state, as well as the gaps in services available and the problems encountered in providing employment services to older persons.

3. Title IX programs operating in the state through national contractors, and the use of Title IX monies going to the state.

4. Interaction between the State Office on Aging and the State Employment Security Agency.

5. Outstanding employment programs for older workers in the state.

6. Interaction with CETA sponsors.

The procedures for setting up the meetings were the same as those used for the meetings at the regional level. The interviews lasted from one to two and one-half hours. In the states of Texas, Ohio, and Florida, part of the discussion focused on the operation of Project RENEW within the state. (RENEW is a Federally-funded, five-state model project in which older persons are trained and placed in local employment offices to assist older people seeking work at the office.) In Iowa, a special meeting was arranged with the national director of RENEW of the Preretirement Planning Center.

Special Study of Older Worker Programs in One State

An in-depth examination of the employment of older workers within one state was made possible by attendance by Project staff at the New York State Training Workshop on Employment of Older Persons. This two-day conference was sponsored by the New York Office on Aging. The purpose was to bring together the agencies concerned with employment and aging: area agencies on aging, Title IX and Title X project sponsors, CETA sponsors, age discrimination and employment agencies, and the voluntary agencies. The workshop included sessions on the goals and programs of the New York Office of Aging, the nature of the problem, age discrimination, manpower programs, job development and job placement techniques, and new legislation. A summary and analysis of the conference proceedings are presented in Appendix B.

OTHER INFORMATION GATHERED

To supplement the data gathered as part of the survey of senior nonprofit employment offices, the survey of older job seekers, and the study of regional and state coordination, additional information was obtained as part of the project. Representatives of all the national Title IX contractors were interviewed concerning the operation of these programs. All available reports of the House and the Senate Committees on Aging concerned with employment or economic needs of older people were analyzed.

Chapter 3

Study of Older Job Seekers

This chapter presents the information gathered from the survey of job seekers, 55 years of age or older. Older applicants to selected employment offices (State Employment Security Offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations) were asked to describe on a questionnaire their employment needs and experiences. A group of those responding to the survey were also interviewed by telephone to learn more about their employment problems: job discrimination, job shift, and employment help needed and received. (See Chapter 2 for a description of the survey methods and Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire.)

This chapter discusses the following points:

- Characteristics of the individuals, 55 or older, who responded to the survey.
- Certain employment experiences and needs of various respondents:
    - -- Those coming to each of the three kinds of employment organizations.
    - -- Men compared to women.
    - -- Job seekers in two age groups: "younger," aged 55-64; and "older," 65 or older.
    - -- Job seekers long-term unemployed versus those short-term unemployed.
    - -- Job seekers looking for the same kind of work they had previously versus those desiring different work.
- Results of the telephone interviews with older job seekers.

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY OF OLDER JOB SEEKERS

Description of Survey Respondents

The data from respondents who were at least 55 years of age are summarized in Tables 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.

The typical survey respondent is seen to be a married, white male, under 65 years of age and at least a high school graduate (see Table 3.1). Employment characteristics of the total sample are shown in Table 3.2. Most of the total group of respondents seek full-time work, often at a lower wage than their last job. About half consider work different from their previous employment. One out of three is discouraged about finding work, and one out of four has been unemployed for more than six months. Most of those who had contacted employers feel that they have been discriminated against because of age.

Table 3.1

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS*
55 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER
(Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	All Respondents 55 and Over (N=1052)
65 Years Of Age Or Over	34
At Least High School Graduate	70
Single/Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	40
Non-White	12
Male	62
Health Limits Work Performance	29

---

*Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age.

Table 3.2

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL SURVEY RESPONDENTS 55 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER[a]

(Means and Percentages)

	All Respondents 55 and Over (N=1052)[b]
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB	
Professional, Technical, Managerial, or Administrative	29%
Hourly Pay	$5.62
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	10%
Laid Off From This Job (% of those not working)	(N=902) 41%
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT	
Hourly Pay	$5.07
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$4.34
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	24%
Number Of Restrictions On Job	3.8
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	31%
Job Sought In Same Occupational Group As Recent Job	58%
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK	
Total Family Income in 1976 Less Than $4000	24%
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	46%
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	39%
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	66%
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	13%

Continued

Table 3.2 (Continued)

	All Respondents 55 and Over (N=1052)[b]
OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS	
Unemployed More Than 6 Months	26%
Retired From A Previous Job	39%
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those who retired)	(N=410) 46%
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	86%
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers)	(N=876) 70%
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	(N=589) 13%

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior non-profit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] As indicated in the table, four items were computed on bases different from that appearing under the column heading. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

Table 3.3

RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON JOB SOUGHT BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS* 55 YEARS OF AGE AND OVER

	Percent Mentioning Restriction
Evening Or Night Work	59
Lifting 20 Pounds Or More	50
Work Requiring Out-Of-Town Travel	54
Job Requiring Moving To Another City	75
Work Requiring Overtime	24
A Job That Would Take More Than 30 Minutes To Get To	32
A Job I Couldn't Reach By Public Transportation	36
A High Pressure Job	53

---

*Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age.

Table 3.4

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] 55 YEARS OF AGE OR OLDER

KIND OF HELP	All Respondents 55 or Older Percent (N=1052)	Rank
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	80	1
Information/Advice On Job Training	16	7
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	10	12
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	23	6
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	12	11
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	14	9.5
List of Job Openings To Look At	55	2
Help In Overcoming Discouragement	15	8
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	40	3
Tips on Selling Self To Employers	14	9.5
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	32	5
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	37	4
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	5	13

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

Table 3.5

OCCUPATION BY SEX AND AGE FOR THOSE 55 OR OLDER AS ESTIMATED FROM THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY[a] AND FOR SURVEY OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE APPLICANTS[b]

(Percentages)

	Current Population Survey				Employment Office Applicants Survey			
	55 to 64		65 or Older		55 to 64		65 or Older	
OCCUPATION	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Professional, Technical	12.4	12.9	13.2	13.0	15.7	7.6	13.9	10.0
Managerial, Administrative	17.7	7.7	16.1	9.2	26.9	5.7	16.7	1.7
Sales	6.3	8.1	8.7	10.0	9.2	8.3	6.5	12.5
Clerical	6.7	29.1	5.7	21.0	9.0	43.6	14.8	50.8
Crafts	21.7	1.9	11.6	1.6	17.7	2.3	18.5	2.5
Operative, Excl.Transport	10.0	13.6	5.0	7.5	5.0	5.3	4.6	0.8
Transportation Operative	5.6	0.4	2.9	0.3	2.7	0.4	5.1	0.0
Non-Farm Labor	5.1	0.9	6.3	0.7	5.7	3.8	6.0	1.7
Household Worker	0.1	5.3	0.2	13.3	0.0	7.6	0.0	10.0
Service	8.5	18.4	13.7	20.6	7.0	15.5	12.5	10.0
Farmer	5.9	1.6	16.6	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	0.0

---

[a] Data provided by Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor from the Current Population Surveys of the U.S.A. January 1977 to November 1977. The data have not been seasonally adjusted.

[b] Data from 1052 HumRRO survey respondents from the State Employment Service offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations.

Financial necessity to work is mentioned by most (70%) of the job seekers, who state that their families could manage only with difficulty if they didn't work. However, the majority say they would work even if they did not need the money. One job seeker made these comments on the nonfinancial reasons for continuing to work: "Unless a person keeps busy like he did in the past he will rot when he gives up and sits. . . Also, earning something is a symbol that you are still of some use in this world."

The typical respondent places several restrictions on the job he seeks (Table 3.2). He is negative about (1) moving to another city, (2) evening or night work, (3) a high pressure job, (4) out-of-town travel, and (5) lifting over 20 pounds. (See Table 3.3.)

The kinds of employment help wanted when applicants came to the employment office are summarized in Table 3.4. They are:

- Someone to find and contact employers.
- A list of job openings.
- Someone to talk with who will understand the personal problems of older job seekers and advise them on how to deal with age discrimination.

Some respondents indicate needs that are not commonly associated with older workers -- for example, information and advice on job training, and help in deciding what kind of work to look for.

Only a few of the older job seekers expressed dissatisfaction with the employment help they have received (Table 3.2).

The older worker job seeker survey was based on a sample of older applicants to selected employment offices, not on a cross section of older workers. Nonetheless, there are similarities between the distribution of occupations of survey respondents and the occupations of older workers in general. In Table 3.5, the results of the Current Population Survey (Departmentof Labor), describing the occupations of individuals, 55 and older, are compared to the occupational distribution of the HumRRO job seeker survey respondents. The survey respondents have been divided into groups by sex and age. Sex and age differences for the HumRRO survey respondents correspond roughly in many respects to those from the Current Population Survey.

There are some major discrepancies, however. While the CPS estimates that 17% of male workers, 65 or older, are farmers, this group is virtually absent from the HumRRO survey. This is understandable since all of the employment offices distributing the HumRRO surveys were located in cities. Also, there is a higher proportion of managers in the HumRRO survey than reported by the CPS, because the HumRRO sampling plan includes Forty Plus offices whose members are almost exclusively professionals or managers.

Other major differences are not so readily explained. Compared to the Current Population Survey, the HumRRO survey is more heavily loaded with clerical workers and has fewer operatives (machinery operators and drivers). One assumption for this could be a self-selection bias due to the fact that the HumRRO survey respondents volunteered to fill out and mail a questionnaire.

The Current Population Survey represents current job holders, not job seekers, and thus provides only a very crude description of the population sampled by the HumRRO survey. Since the local offices of the State Employment Service systematically record the occupation of all applicants, they would seem to be a good source of statistics describing the SES older applicant population. However, the Department of Labor could not furnish these statistics since the information gathered by the State Employment Service on occupations of applicants are not analyzed by the two age categories, 55 to 64, and 65 and older, with which the HumRRO survey was concerned.

The survey data on all respondents are summarized in Tables 3.1 to 3.5. Further details of the survey answers of those 55 and older are given in tables in Appendix C.

Needs and Characteristics of Respondents and Type of Employment Office Visited

In Tables 3.6, 3.7, and 3.8 are presented data comparing respondents who went to the Forty Plus organizations, the State Employment Service, and the senior nonprofit employment offices.

Forty Plus Organizations

The Forty Plus organizations primarily assist unemployed executives and professionals. They share office space and help each other with their job hunt. The backgrounds of the respondents who are Forty Plus members are different from those of the respondents going to other employment organizations. They are virtually all middle-aged, highly educated, white males, having worked in a professional or administrative job. (See Table 3.6.) They seek high paying, generally full-time positions and generally in the same field in which they worked previously. They are likely to have been laid off rather than retired, or, if retired, they more often retired involuntarily. (See Table 3.7.)

Compared to other job seekers, Forty Plus members look for work over a wider geographic area. They more often want information on job opportunities in other cities, and less frequently than other job seekers, place restrictions on job location. (See Tables 3.6 and 3.8.) The kinds of job help that Forty Plus members more often want are the kinds of assistance often provided by Forty Plus organizations: help in finding good job leads, tips on writing a resume, advice on how to act in job interviews, and tips on "selling" themselves to employers.

Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices Versus State Employment Offices

Applicants to senior nonprofit employment offices include a much higher proportion of individuals looking for post-retirement jobs to supplement other income than do applicants to State Employment Service offices. (See Tables 3.6 and 3.7.) A higher proportion of applicants to senior nonprofit offices are in the older age group (65 or older), are retired, and seeking part-time work. Fewer continue working in the same field as their previous employment. They do not feel as great a financial necessity to work: fewer say their families would have great difficulty if they were unemployed and more of them look for work because of boredom.

Table 3.6

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY EMPLOYMENT OFFICE TYPE (Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS:	State Employment Service (N=620)	Nonprofit Office (N=351)	Forty Plus Office (N=81)	Sig. of Dif.[b] Forty Plus/Other	Sig. of Dif.[b] SES/Nonprofit
65 Years of Age Or Over	32	44	10	**	**
At Least High School Graduate	64	73	98	**	**
Single/Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	39	46	26	**	*
Non-White	15	9	2	**	**
Male	62	55	95	**	
Health Limits Work Performance	28	35	11	**	*

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.7

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY EMPLOYMENT OFFICE TYPE
(Means and Percentages)

	State Employment Service (N=620)[b]	Nonprofit Offices (N=351)	Forty Plus Offices (N=81)	Sig. of Dif.[c] Forty Plus/Other	Sig. of Dif.[c] SES/Nonprofit
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB					
Professional, Technical, Managerial, Or Administrative	24%	21%	95%	**	
Hourly Pay	$5.38	$4.70	$11.70	**	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	9%	14%	0%	**	*
Laid Off From This Job (% of those not working)	(N=557) 48%	(N=271) 23%	(N=74) 53%	*	**
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT					
Hourly Pay	$5.08	$3.65	$10.54	**	**
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$4.39	$3.20	$8.48	**	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	18%	41%	1%	**	**
Number Of Restrictions On Job	3.8	4.2	1.8	**	**
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	34%	26%	29%		*
Recent Job And Job Sought In Same Occupational Group	61%	47%	79%	**	**
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK					
Total Family Income In 1976 Less Than $4000	23%	30%	7%	**	*
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	48%	46%	26%	**	

Continued

Table 3.7 (Continued)

	State Employment Service (N=620)[b]	Nonprofit Offices (N=351)	Forty Plus Offices (N=81)	Sig. of Dif.[c] Forty Plus/Other	Sig. of Dif.[c] SES/Nonprofit
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK (Cont'd)					
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	41%	33%	44%		*
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	63%	66%	86%	**	
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	11%	18%	14%		**
OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS					
Unemployed More Than 6 Months	26%	20%	46%	**	*
Retired From A Previous Job	36%	46%	36%		**
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those retired)	(N=222) 51%	(N=159) 36%	(N=28) 57%		**
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	83%	72%	96%	**	**
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers	(N=535) 70%	(N=263) 64%	(N=78) 88%	**	
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	(N=333) 14%	(N=193) 12%	(N=63) 13%		

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] As indicated in the table, several items were computed on bases different from those appearing under the column headings. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.8

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE

KIND OF HELP	State Emp. Service Percentage (N=620)	State Emp. Service Rank	Nonprofit Office Percentage (N=351)	Nonprofit Office Rank	Forty Plus Office Percentage (N=81)	Forty Plus Office Rank	Sig. of Dif.[b] Forty Plus/Other	Sig. of Dif.[b] SES/Nonprofit
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	78	1	82	1	85	1		
Information/Advice On Job Training	16	7	15	7	20	12		
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	10	11.5	6	12	31	8.5	**	
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	23	6	24	5.5	25	10		
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	10	11.5	7	10.5	53	7	**	
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	11	9.5	7	10.5	63	4	**	*
List Of Job Openings To Look At	56	2	47	2	84	2	**	**
Help In Overcoming Discouragement	15	8	14	8	21	11		
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	41	3	40	3	31	8.5		
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	11	9.5	8	9	54	6	**	
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	30	5	24	5.5	72	3	**	*
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	39	4	27	4	59	5	**	**
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	6	13	3	13	9	13		*

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

A higher proportion of those going to the State Employment Service offices, than the applicants to the senior nonprofit employment offices, say they want each kind of help listed. However, the rank ordering of assistance wanted by applicants to these offices is almost identical, as seen in Table 3.8.

Other tables describing the characteristics of respondents by the type of employment office visited appear in Appendix C.

Since Forty Plus respondents are such a homogeneous group (white, middle-aged, male professionals and executives) they have been excluded from all of the data analyses presented below. If they were not deleted, the analysis of age and sex differences that follow would be partly a reflection of the Forty Plus--non-Forty Plus differences.

Comparison of Respondents by Age Group

Tables 3.9, 3.10, and 3.11 present the comparison of survey responses from the older group of respondents (age 65 or more) and the younger group (age 55 to 64), who visited State Employment Service offices and the senior nonprofit employment offices. Forty Plus respondents have been excluded from these tabulations.

The two age groups are similar in type of work and pay for their last job but differ in the jobs they seek. Respondents 65 or older tend to seek part-time work and will accept lower pay, because they feel less financial necessity to work than the younger age group. In addition, they place more restrictions on the kind of job they want. (See Table 3.10.)

An older man wrote to explain the adjustments he thinks older workers must make. "They need something to do to feel that they are not 'over the hill', he commented. "They also know that they are not 'kids' anymore and can't do some of the athletic type jobs and they can't bend so easily as they could when younger. It's a difficult job to get 'older' people into the right job (for them to feel satisfied and worthwhile). The attitude of the individual is basic. He must be retrained to accept a lesser important job momentarily while thinking he is helping the other person."

A comparison of the demographic characteristics of the two age groups (Table 3.9) shows that among younger respondents there is a somewhat higher proportion of high school graduates, and more men than women.

Both groups have similar ranking in their requests for employment help. The younger respondents, however, are more likely to want each kind of help and are more often dissatisfied with the help they received.

Comparison of Female and Male Job Seekers

Tables 3.12, 3.13, and 3.14 present a comparison between male and female job seekers. Only the survey respondents from State Employment Service offices

Table 3.9

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY AGE GROUP (Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	55 to 64 (N=619)	65 and Over (N=352)	Signif. of Dif.[b]
At Least High School Graduate	72	59	**
Single/Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	42	41	
Non-White	14	11	
Male	57	63	*
Health Limits Work Performance	32	29	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 Level.

Table 3.10

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY AGE GROUP

(Means and Percentages)

	55 to 64 (N=619)[b]	65 and Over (N=352)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB			
Professional, Technical, Managerial, Or Administrative	24%	22%	
Hourly Pay	$5.10	$5.23	
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	90%	15%	**
Laid Off From This Job (% of those not working)	(N=526) 48%	(N=302) 26%	**
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT			
Hourly Pay	$4.76	$4.23	**
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$4.12	$3.70	*
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	16%	46%	**
Number Of Restrictions On Job	3.7	4.5	**
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	32%	29%	
Recent Job And Job Sought In Same Occupational Group	57%	54%	
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK			
Total Family Income In 1976 Less Than $4000	26%	24%	
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	53%	38%	**
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	45%	26%	**
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	65%	62%	
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	11%	18%	**

Continued

Table 3.10 (Continued)

	55 to 64 (N=619)[b]	65 and Over (N=352)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS			
Unemployed More Than 6 Months	24%	24%	
Retired From A Previous Job	24%	67%	**
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those retired)	(N=150) 27%	(N=231) 56%	**
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	82%	74%	*
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers)	(N=524) 66%	(N=274) 70%	
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	(N=332) 17%	(N=194) 7%	**

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] As indicated in the table, several items were computed on bases different from those appearing under the column headings. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.11

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY AGE GROUP

KIND OF HELP	55 to 64		65 and Over		Signif. of Dif.[b]
	Percent (N=619)	Rank	Percent (N=352)	Rank	
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	81	1	77	1	
Information/Advice On Job Training	19	7	9	7	**
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	11	10.5	4	12.5	**
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	25	6	20	6	
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	10	12	6	10.5	*
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	11	10.5	6	10.5	**
List Of Job Openings To Look At	57	2	44	2	**
Help With Overcoming Discouragement	18	8	8	8	**
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	44	3	35	3	**
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	12	9	7	9	*
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	32	5	21	5	**
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	37	4	31	4	*
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	6	13	4	12.5	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

64

and senior nonprofit employment offices are included in these tabulations.

The family situation is found to be markedly different for male and female respondents. Two-thirds of women completing the survey had no spouse (single, separated, divorced, or widowed) compared to one-fourth of the men. (See Table 3.12.)

The well-known facts about jobs and pay for women are reflected in these survey results. The recent jobs of female respondents tend to be concentrated in certain relatively low-paying occupations: clerks, service workers and household workers. Compared to men, they are under represented in the higher paying professional, technical, managerial, and crafts jobs. (See Tables 3.5 and 3.13.) They are more likely to report recent part-time employment, in jobs that do not offer retirement benefits.

The women respondents list a much lower family income than do the men. In fact, the majority report that their family income would be less than $4,000 if they do not earn wages. However, women are no more likely than the men to claim financial hardship for their family if they are unemployed (Table 3.13). This finding can be explained in part by the greater number of dependents for male respondents.

The fact that about one-third of the women surveyed are widows suggests that a number of them may be "displaced homemakers," having to seek paid work after years of being mainly a "housewife." The survey information on prior employment does not permit identification of the displaced homemakers in the sample. However, a higher proportion of women than men call for help in job training, and displaced homemakers often require job training.

Some of the letters accompanying the survey forms explained the particular employment problems of displaced homemakers.

One woman wrote: "I had never worked on a public job until I was divorced ...I was brought up on a farm...I have always believed that a mother's place is at home with her children unless it is necessary for her to work...When I had to find work, had I been young I believe I could have gotten a job in a factory. I tried but failed. The type jobs I had to take I could not stay with because of health reasons. So I have ended up on welfare, which I hate."

Another woman commented: "I was 'Mrs. Somebody Important' for a good many years, but found myself 'turned into a pumpkin' and suddenly in the position of being 'the Captain of my own ship' after spending more than one-half of my life in total dependence on another person. I immediately thought my life was destroyed, but thank God quickly made the determination that it was within my OWN power to either sink or stay afloat. I have a wealth of background in Community service, and for mamy years made an unsalaried contribution to the Community...The agencies do NOT know what to do with me, because I do not have a wealth of PAID experience, but my premise is that if I can do all the things I have done with NO experience, just THINK of what I can do when somebody will hire me and I can GET some experience."

Another respondent stated her needs this way: "Would like more on-the-job training and also a chance to prove we are capable of doing and learning new activities...I need a job now, as I need to support myself."

Table 3.12

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY SEX
(Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	Female (N=396)	Male (N=573)	Signif. of Dif.[b]
65 Years Of Age Or Over	33	39	*
At Least High School Graduate	67	67	
Single/Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	67	24	**
Non-White	16	10	**
Health Limits Work Performance	32	30	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.13

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY SEX
(Means and Percentages)

	Female (N=396)	Male (N=573)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB			
Professional, Technical Managerial, Or Administrative	12%	31%	**
Hourly Pay	$3.61	$6.13	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	19%	6%	**
Laid Off From This Job (% of those not working)	(N=329) 40%	(N=498) 40%	
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT			
Hourly Pay	$3.48	$5.30	**
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$3.08	$4.56	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	33%	22%	**
Number Of Restrictions On Job	4.8	3.4	**
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	31%	32%	
Recent Job And Job Sought In Same Occupational Group	54%	57%	
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK			
Total Family Income In 1976 Less Than $4000	37%	18%	**
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	63%	37%	**
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	41%	37%	
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	57%	69%	**
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	10%	16%	

Continued

Table 3.13 (Continued)

OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS	Female (N=396)[b]	Male (N=573)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
Unemployed More Than 6 Months	19%	28%	**
Retired From A Previous Job	26%	49%	**
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those retired)	(N=104) 41%	(N=277) 46%	
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	75%	82%	*
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers)	(N=312) 62%	(N=484) 71%	**
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	(N=208) 11%	(N=316) 15%	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] As indicated in the table, items were computed on bases different from those appearing under the column headings. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.14

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY SEX

KIND OF HELP	Female		Male		Signif. of Dif.[b]
	Percent	Rank	Percent	Rank	
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	77	1	81	1	
Information/Advice On Job Training	19	7	13	8	*
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	4	13	11	10.5	**
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	23	6	23	6	
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	8	9.5	10	12	
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	8	9.5	11	10.5	
List of Job Openings To Look At	49	2	55	2	
Help With Overcoming Discouragement	17	8	13	8	
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	43	3	39	3	
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	7	11	13	8	**
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	28	5	29	5	
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	32	4	37	4	
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	5	12	5	13	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

69

Male respondents undergo a greater change in jobs compared to their last employment, judging from hourly pay and work hours. On the average, men look for a job with a pay rate 14% lower than their most recent job, while women, on the average, look for one with a pay rate only 4% lower. The number of men seeking part-time work is about four times the number of those whose recent job was part-time, compared to a two-fold increase for women. The Social Security earning limitations are the probable explanation for these facts. Having been in higher paying jobs than women, men more often have to change their employment to stay within the earning limitations imposed by Social Security.

Duration of Unemployment

The characteristics of long and short-term unemployed respondents are given in Tables 3.15, 3.16, and 3.17. These tabulations include those from offices of the State Employment Service and from senior nonprofit employment offices.

The long-term unemployed (more than six months with no job and looking for work) are more likely than short-term unemployed respondents to have been working in a higher paying professional, technical, or administrative job (Table 3.16). Table 3.7 shows that Forty Plus respondents are more often long-term unemployed than applicants to other kinds of employment offices. Virtually all Forty Plus members have recent professional or administrative jobs.

Some long-term unemployed respondents described their difficulties in detail. An unemployed manager wrote, "I have been actively answering ads and sending out dozens of professionally prepared resumes to potential public and private sector employers since before Christmas 1976. For the most part these applicantions have been for positions for which I know my qualifications are equal to those of any other potential candidates, and in some cases probably superior. What is most disheartening to me and I am sure to others is to spend the time to prepare a professional application and not even receive the courtesy of a reply, or acknowledgment. This never happened to me when I was younger and so I have to conclude that it is because I am now over fifty."

Another man wrote, "I have been an unemployed chemist since December, 1972...I have a PhD degree...in Physical Chemistry. I have also served in the U.S. Army for over five years as an officer...Yet, I have not earned the right to work. I only worked for two companies in private industry, so I am not a 'job jumper.' I lost my job through a reduction in force when the NCR Corporation eliminated their Research Division."

As can be seen, many long-term unemployed are discouraged about finding work. They more often feel they are victims of age discrimination, and they want help in this area from the employment office. (See Tables 3.16 and 3.17.)

Table 3.15

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

(Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	Unemployed 6 Months or Less (N=367)	Unemployed Over 6 Months (N=235)	Signif. of Dif.[b]
65 Years Of Age Or Over	33	36	
At Least High School Graduate	66	73	
Single/Separated/ Divorced/Widowed	39	34	
Non-White	12	11	
Male	63	68	
Health Limits Work Performance	30	26	

---

[a] Unemployed survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age. Unemployed means out of work, looking for work, and able to accept a job.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: None of the comparisons in this table were significant at the .05 level.

Table 3.16

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF UNEMPLOYED SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT (Means and Percentages)

	Unemployed 6 Months or Less (N=367)[b]	Unemployed Over 6 Months (N=235)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB			
Professional, Technical, Managerial, Or Administrative	23%	32%	*
Hourly Pay	$5.27	$5.77	*
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	8%	4%	
Laid Off From This Job	43%	42%	
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT			
Hourly Pay	$4.69	$5.02	
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$4.11	$4.23	
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	20%	24%	
Number Of Restrictions On Job	4.0	3.7	*
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	29%	44%	**
Recent Job And Job Sought In Same Occupational Group	63%	57%	
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK			
Total Family Income In 1976 Less Than $4000	18%	29%	**
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	48%	41%	
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	42%	37%	
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	68%	65%	
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	16%	13%	

Continued

Table 3.16 (Continued)

	Unemployed 6 Months or Less (N=367)[b]	Unemployed Over 6 Months (N=235)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS			
Retired From A Previous Job	40%	42%	
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those retired)	(N=149) 43%	(N=97) 60%	**
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	84%	94%	**
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers)	(N=318) 66%	(N=223) 77%	**
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	(N=196) 11%	(N=136) 15%	

---

[a] Unemployed survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age. Unemployed means out of work, looking for work, and able to accept a job.

[b] As indicated in the table, several items were computed on bases different from those appearing under the column headings. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.17

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY UNEMPLOYED SURVEY RESPONDENTS BY DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT

KIND OF HELP	Unemployed 6 Months or Less Percent (N=367)	Unemployed 6 Months or Less Rank	Unemployed Over 6 Months Percent (N=235)	Unemployed Over 6 Months Rank	Signif. of Dif.[b]
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	83	1	82	1	
Information/Advice On Job Training	14	8	20	7	
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	8	12	12	11	
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	22	6	24	6	
Advice On How To Act In Job Interview	10	9.5	10	12	
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	9	11	14	8	
List Of Job Openings To Look At	55	2	59	2	
Help In Overcoming Discouragement	15	7	13	9.5	
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	45	3	39	4	
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	10	9.5	13	9.5	
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	28	5	30	5	
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	33	4	44	3	*
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	4	13	7	13	

---

[a] Unemployed survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices, senior nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus organizations who were at least 55 years of age. Unemployed means out of work, looking for work, and able to accept a job.

[b] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Change in Occupation

Tables 3.18, 3.19 and 3.20 show the demographic and employment characteristics for respondents looking for, and those not looking for, the same kind of work they had previously. Only respondents from offices of the State Employment Service and senior nonprofit offices have been included in these tables.

Whether the job sought is in the same field as the recent job was defined using the Bureau of Census broad occupation categories: professional, technical; administrative, managerial; clerical; sales; crafts; operatives (machine operators, drivers); service workers ; household workers; non-farm laborer; and farmers. If both jobs fell into the same category they were considered the same kind of work.

When "job sought" was compared to "recent job" for respondents, it was found that 56% were seeking the same kind of work, 16% were looking for a different category of work, and 28% were unsure of the duties or title of the work they were seeking. The last group included individuals who said they did not know the duties for the job sought, who did not answer the question, and who described the duties of the job sought so vaguely that it could not be coded into one of the broad occupational categories. However, almost all of the respondents who were unsure of duties or title of the desired job had in mind specific features for a desired job -- pay, work hours, or restrictions such as job location, job demands, etc. (Of the 267 respondents who were unsure of job title or duties 262 of them specified other job characteristics.)

Respondents not seeking the same work as they had previously, compared to those seeking the same type of work -- (1) are more often retired from a job other than a professional, technical or managerial job and are looking for a lower paying and part-time job; (2) are likely to report that their health limits their job performance; (3) ask for advice on training and for help in deciding what kind of work to look for; and (4) are less likely to want a list of job openings which they could look over themselves.

Table 3.21 shows how type of recent job is related to whether or not respondents are seeking the same type of work. Respondents whose recent work was professional, technical, or clerical are the most likely to want to continue working in a job like their previous one, while operatives and laborers show the least attachment to their previous type of work. Operatives and laborers are also most likely not to know the duties involved in the job they are seeking.

The kinds of jobs wanted by respondents desiring to change type of job are given in Table 3.22. These individuals are most likely to seek clerical or service work.

INTERVIEWS WITH OLDER JOB SEEKERS

Telephone interviews were conducted with a subsample of 51 respondents to the survey in order to learn more about their reasons for desiring job change, their experiences with job discrimination because of age, and their

Table 3.18

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY WHETHER JOB SOUGHT IS IN SAME FIELD AS LAST JOB[b]

(Percentages)

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS	Seeking Job In Same Field (N=527)	Not Seeking Job In Same Field (N=416)	Signif. of Dif.[c]
65 Years Of Age Or Over	34	38	
At Least High School Graduate	70	64	*
Single/Separated Divorced/Widowed	39	44	
Non-White	11	14	
Male	60	58	
Health Limits Work Performance	27	35	**

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] If job sought fell in the same occupational group as recent job (using the 12 Census categories defined earlier) it was considered to be in the same field.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.19

EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY WHETHER JOB SOUGHT IS IN SAME FIELD AS LAST JOB[b]

(Means and Percentages)

	Seeking Job in Same Field (N=527)[c]	Not Seeking Job in Same Field (N=416)	Signif. of Dif.[d]
CHARACTERISTICS OF RECENT JOB			
Professional, Technical, Managerial, Or Administrative	27%	18%	**
Hourly Pay	$5.53	$4.68	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	9%	14%	**
Laid Off From This Job (% of those not working)	(N=477) 44%	(N=337) 35%	**
CHARACTERISTICS OF JOB SOUGHT			
Hourly Pay	$5.07	$3.87	**
Minimum Hourly Pay Acceptable	$4.38	$3.34	**
Part-Time Work (<30 Hrs/Week)	21%	34%	**
Number Of Restrictions On Job	3.9	4.1	
Discouraged About Prospects For Finding Job Sought	31%	32%	
FAMILY INCOME AND NEED TO WORK			
Total Family Income In 1976 Less Than $4000	23%	28%	*
Total Family Income If Not Working Less Than $4000	46%	48%	
If Not Working, Could Manage With Great Difficulty Or Not At All	38%	39%	
Would Work Even If Money Not Needed	67%	62%	
Started Looking For Work Due To Boredom	13%	14%	

Continued

Table 3.19 (Continued)

	Seeking Job in Same Field (N=527)[c]	Not Seeking Job in Same Field (N=416)	Signif. of Dif.[d]
OTHER EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS			
Unemployed More Than 6 Months	25%	23%	
Retired From A Previous Job	36%	43%	*
Was Forced To Retire From Above Job (% of those retired)	(N=188) 52%	(N=179) 38%	**
Personally Contacted Employers During Job Search	84%	73%	**
Claimed Age Discrimination By Employers (% of those who contacted employers)	71%	64%	*
Dissatisfied With Employment Office Help (% of respondents who were able to give a rating)	13%	13%	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] If job sought fell in the same occupational group as recent job (using the 12 Census categories defined earlier) it was considered to be in the same field.

[c] As indicated in the table, several items were computed on bases different from those appearing under the column headings. In those cases the correct Ns appear in parentheses above the percentage figures affected. Other Ns fluctuate slightly from item to item because of missing cases.

[d] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.20

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS[a] BY WHETHER JOB SOUGHT IS IN SAME FIELD AS LAST JOB[b]

KIND OF HELP	Seeking Job in Same Field Percent (N=527)	Seeking Job in Same Field Rank	Not Seeking Job in Same Field Percent (N=416)	Not Seeking Job in Same Field Rank	Signif. of Dif.[c]
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	81	1	79	1	
Information/Advice On Job Training	12	8	20	7	**
Information On Jobs In Other Towns	9	11.5	8	12	
Help In Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	16	6	32	5	**
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	9	11.5	9	10.5	
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	10	10	9	10.5	
List Of Job Openings To Look At	57	2	47	2	**
Help In Overcoming Discouragement	13	7	17	8	
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	39	3	43	3	
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	11	9	10	9	
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	29	5	28	6	
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	36	4	34	4	
Other Kinds Of Employment Help	6	13	4	13	

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior non-profit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus offices) who were at least 55 years of age.

[b] If job sought fell in the same occupational group as recent job (using the 12 Census categories defined earlier) it was considered to be in the same field.

[c] Significance of differences between groups: * = significant at the .05 level, and ** = significant at the .01 level.

Table 3.21

SEEKING SAME OR DIFFERENT KIND OF WORK BY TYPE OF RECENT JOB[a]

RECENT JOB[c]	Number of Respondents	Job Sought Compared to Recent Job[b] Same Job (%)	Different Job (%)	Can't Classify Job Sought[d] (%)
Professional, Technical	104	73	10	17
Manager, Administrator	112	59	20	21
Sales	86	50	28	22
Clerical	243	68	7	25
Crafts	118	62	14	24
Operative	68	38	21	41
Non-Farm Labor	48	31	19	50
Service	108	41	27	32
Household Worker	32	53	9	38
TOTAL	919	56	16	28

---

[a] Survey respondents from State Employment Service local offices and senior nonprofit offices (excluding Forty Plus) who described their recent job.

[b] If the job sought fell in the same category as the recent job, it was classified as the "same job".

[c] The category of "farmer" has been excluded from the tabulation since only four respondents were farmers. "Transportation operatives" and "non-transportation operatives" have been combined into a single "operative" category. The recent job descriptions of two respondents were uncodable. These two respondents were excluded.

[d] "Can't classify job sought" means that the job could not be coded into one of the job categories listed above.

Table 3.22

TYPE OF WORK SOUGHT BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS SEEKING A TYPE OF JOB DIFFERENT FROM THEIR RECENT JOB[a]

JOB TYPE[b]	Percent Seeking Job Type
Professional, Technical	9
Managerial, Administrative	8
Sales	12
Clerical	29
Crafts	2
Operative	3
Non-farm laborer	4
Service	23
Household worker	15
	100

---

[a] Information is for the 147 respondents from State Employment Service offices and senior nonprofit employment offices who were seeking a different type of work than their previous job.

[b] The category of "farmer" has been excluded from the tabulation since only four respondents were coded as farmers. "Transportation operatives" and "Non-transportation operatives" have been combined to a single "Operative" category.

evaluation of assistance provided by employment offices. The interview guide will be found in Appendix A.

Individuals selected for interview were unemployed at the time of the mail survey and had reported that without a job their families could manage financially only with difficulty. Each had received and completed one of the HumRRO questionnaires at a senior nonprofit employment office. The sample for the telephone interviews included:

- 17 men, 55 to 59 years of age.
- 17 men, 65 or older.
- 8 women, 55 to 59 years of age.
- 9 women, 65 or older.

Job Change

At the time of the interview, 27 of the 51 respondents were found to be working or seeking work in a different field from the one they had worked in longest. The job changes for the 27 respondents and their main reasons for changing are described in Table 3.23. Reasons most often given are because work in the former occupation is not readily available (13 cases), and because there is a need for less demanding work (10 cases).

Many of the respondents appeared to be vague as to the specifications of type of work sought. Seven of the 14 people still seeking work defined their job choice as "anything" or "don't know." (The mail survey found that about 60% of those who were not seeking the same type of work did not know just what type of work -- that is, duties or title, they wanted.)

Help From Senior Nonprofit Employment Office

Respondents were asked to evaluate the help received from the senior nonprofit employment offices where they had received the HumRRO questionnaire.

One kind of evaluation can be made from the respondent's statement of whether he received the kind of job help he wanted. Each person had checked on his survey form the kind of employment help he was looking for. In the interview two months later, respondents indicated whether they had received each kind of help they had sought. The results are shown in Table 3.24.

Most frequently mentioned was the need for someone to find and contact employers who might be interested in hiring them. Most respondents said that this help was given. (It was rated as the single most important kind of help by the overwhelming majority of interview respondents as well as the entire group of respondents to the mail survey.)

Certain less urgently needed kinds of help were often not received: advice on job training, information on job opportunities in other towns, and advice on how to deal with age discrimination.

Table 3.23

JOB SHIFTS AND REASONS REPORTED BY SURVEY RESPONDENTS WHO WERE INTERVIEWED[a]

Unemployed Respondents Seeking Different Work From Job Held Longest[b]

Job Held Longest	Job Sought	Reason For Shift
heavy equipment operator	"anything"	health
manager in trucking firm	clerk	don't want job respondibility
custom picture framer	"anything"	can't do standing required by former job
chef	"anything-- guard, driver"	seeking lighter, part-time work
domestic work	"anything but domestic work"	"just can't do it anymore"
clerk in bakery	companion to elderly	heart attack -- must have lighter work
store clerk	don't know	can't take stress of customers
photoengraving	clerical	job has changed -- new process
U.S. mail carrier	clerical	work as mail carrier not available
factory work, plastics	don't know	no plastics factories here
international program specialist	personnel work	few openings in field
income tax auditor	clerk in store	tired of former job
assistant mortician	campanion to elderly	assisted husband in funeral business before he died and don't want to do this work anymore
shoe store clerk	"anything"	this sales job does not pay well in this area

Continued

Table 3.23 (Continued)

Employed Respondents Whose Current Work is Different From Job Held Longest[c]

Job Held Longest	Current Job	Reason for Shift
restaurant cook	cashier	allergic to flour
kitchen helper	companion to elderly	can't stand on feet for long periods of time
warehouseman	janitor	can't do heavy lifting
accounting clerk	receptionist	couldn't find job in area of experience
training director	construction	couldn't find job in area of experience
inventory clerk	service station attendant	couldn't find job in area of experience
grocery clerk	liquor store clerk	couldn't find job in area of experience
liquor store manager	real estate salesperson	couldn't find job in area of experience
department manager	office equipment sales	couldn't find job in area of experience
employment claims examiner	job developer	couldn't find job in area of experience
tax assessor	selling shirts in family business	couldn't find job in area of experience
office work	companion to elderly	couldn't find job in area of experience
work with C.I.A.	parking attendant	no civilian equivalent of C.I.A. job

---

[a] The table summarizes occupational changes reported by the 51 older job seekers who responded to the job seeker survey and were interviewed by telephone two months later. The 27 cases of those interviewed who reported changes in job sought or current employment compared to job held longest are described in the table.

[b] These respondents were unemployed at the time of the mail survey and were still unemployed at the time of the telephone interview.

[c] These respondents were unemployed at the time of the mail survey, but had obtained employment when interviewed by telephone two months later.

Table 3.24

EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED AND RECEIVED FROM SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES[a]

EMPLOYMENT HELP	Number Wanting This Help[b]	Number Getting This Help[c]	Percent of Those Wanting This Help Who Received It
Someone To Find And Contact Employers	44	36	82%
List Of Job Openings For Respondent To Look Over	32	17	53%
Someone To Understand Personal Problems	28	21	75%
Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	21	8	38%
Advice On How To Find Good Job Leads	17	11	65%
Help Deciding Kind Of Work To Look For	12	8	67%
Tips On Writing A Good Resume	12	8	67%
Help With Overcoming Discouragement	12	6	50%
Advice On How To Act In Job Interviews	11	6	55%
Tips On Selling Self To Employers	9	4	44%
Information On Job Opportunities In Other Towns	9	2	22%
Information Or Advice On Job Training	8	2	25%

---

[a] The information for this table was provided by 51 survey respondents from nonprofit employment offices who were later interviewed.

[b] The information on help wanted was from answers to the job seeker questionnaire.

[c] The information on whether help was received came from telephone interviews two months after questionnaires were completed.

Most respondents (35 of the 51) felt that the employment help they were given at the nonprofit office was "good" or "excellent." In explaining their rating, respondents commonly mentioned a genuine interest shown in them and the helpfulness of the office staff. Many indicated they had obtained job leads from the office. From the minority (14) who gave ratings of "fair," "poor" or "no help," the common reasons were either that they did not receive any job leads from the office, or that the office never contacted them despite a promise to do so.

Assistance From State Employment Service Offices

Those interviewed were asked whether they had gone to the State Employment Service (SES) as part of their current job hunt and if not, why not. Those going to the public employment offices rated the service they received and explained the basis for their rating.

Twenty people said they did not go to SES for help while looking for work: Nearly half (9) said they never thought of it or they were too busy and didn't get around to it; five said they did not think the SES would have anything in their field or anything they would be interested in; four cited previous bad experiences in dealing with the SES; and two said they did not need the help of the SES.

The mean rating given to the State Employment Service was "fair." Of the nine people who rated the SES help as "good" or "excellent," four were pleased because the SES had placed them in jobs, three felt that the SES did what it could; and two were pleased because the SES provided job listings.

The major reason given for rating SES help as "fair" or "poor" was a feeling that the staff was generally unresponsive and not helpful. Seven of the 15 respondents who rated SES help "fair" or "poor" mentioned these feelings as reasons for rating the office low. (Three of the seven complained that they were simply escorted to a machine where they were instructed to select their own job leads and were given little additional help.) Three people were dissatisfied because they were given no job leads, three more said they received job leads but none had paid off, and two complained that only lower level jobs were listed with the SES.

Six people rated the State Employment Service "no help at all." Three felt that filling out an SES application form was little more than an empty formality as required when filing for unemployment compensation. One said that the SES office did not have any opportunities at his level of ability and salary, one felt the SES was too bureaucratic, and the remaining person complained that most jobs listed by the SES were already filled.

Age Discrimination By Employers

In all, 60% (32 out of 51) of those interviewed felt they had been discriminated against because of their age. However, when they were pressed for a specific example, only 10 indivdiuals gave a specific instance of age discrimination by employers.

The specific instances of age discrimination given by the 10 respondents follow. Age was mentioned by the employer in only six of these examples.

- "A company told me they had a new age rule and they couldn't hire me."
- "I was virtually assured of a job until I mentioned my age."
- "I was told I was overqualified in a way that definitely implied too old."
- "I was interviewed for job as driver of tour bus. The man said I was too old and he didn't think I had the personality."
- "I applied for a job doing office work. The man told me I was too old."
- "A building outfit was looking for someone to clean out new houses. They told me they were looking for a younger person."
- "A national private employment office told me as soon as I walked in that they didn't have anything for me. It must have been age."
- "One company didn't have age on their application form, but they asked age anyway. When I told them, they said they would call me but they never did."
- "I applied for a job in a doctor's office. I called later to find out about it and the girl said 'No, I'm afraid it's your age'."

A letter from one survey respondent provides a detailed account of discrimination experiences:

"Let me give you samples of employment discrimination I have experienced as an elderly applicant. All of the many application forms I have filled indicated 'This is an equal employment opportunity employer,' yet, I note the following:

"1. All selecting officials I interviewed asked me my age. Why? I assumed they felt I was too old.

"2. All job application forms requested disclosure of date of birth. Only on one application form I noted instruction that date of birth to be filled only after I'm selected for the job.

"3. All requested names and dates of all schools attended.

"4. All wanted a list of all previous employment indicating date started and ended.

"5. Plus all my personnel history data was available to selecting officials. In fact they had all this information in their hands during the interview.

"I was discriminated against so many times that I am very discouraged. Example: I send a resume indicating that I have years of experience as an automotive foreman giving details on the type and nature of work performed, the number of personnel I supervised and including outstanding and superior performance awards I received, letters of commendation, etc. I always receive a nice letter or phone call that they are impressed with my credentials and requesting I come in for interview.

"On these interviews I am asked to fill out a personnel history application form when I had to disclose my date of birth, etc., plus they always ask me for my age. They all say they will let me know about the selection, some do, some don't even bother.

"I found this same practice even with the Federal, State and City and County and Local government agencies. I took Civil Service exams for many vacant positions, making grades of 100, 95, and in the 90's. I was ranked No. 1 on two positions, No. 2 in one position and top ranked in others. I was always asked how old I was by the selecting official. It's hard to think there was no discrimination when somebody young and just barely meeting the necessary qualification is selected when you are by-passed with a score of 100 and ranked No. 1."

SUMMARY

Questionnaires on employment needs and experiences were distributed to older job seekers by selected employment offices across the nation. Usable surveys were received from 1,052 job seekers aged 55 or older. Telephone interviews were carried out with a selected group of 51 of these respondents.

The major findings of the mail survey and telephone interviews are summarized in the following paragraphs. The findings are generally based on the results from questionnaires received from applicants to a State Employment Service office or a senior nonprofit employment office. The 72 Forty Plus respondents are not included. The findings in the section, Kinds of People Served by Various Types of Employment Offices, include all respondents.

Reason for Seeking Work

Many of the respondents were forced by their employers to leave their last job: They were laid off, or they were forced to retire. The majority of all respondents (75%) sought work to support themselves and their families. However, their desire for employment was not purely financial since many (66%) said they would want to work even if they had enough money to live comfortably without working.

Kind of Work Sought

Half of the respondents wanted to do the same type of work as their recent job -- for example, clerical, craft, sales, service. Those who have retired were likely to consider a different type of job than their previous one and were often interested in part-time work at a lower hourly wage than their recent job. A fourth of the respondents did not know the title or duties of the job they sought, but they knew the pay rate they wanted, the number of hours per week desired, and their own specific restrictions on working conditions. The majority of respondents would not consider a job requiring a move to another city, out-of-town travel, or evening or night work, but few would rule out work requiring overtime. The majority (70%) said their health did not limit the kind or amount of work they could do.

Kinds of People Served by Various Types of Employment Offices

The Forty Plus respondents were found to have a different background from those going to other kinds of employment agencies. Virtually all those from Forty Plus organizations were middle-aged, highly educated, white males, having worked in a professional or administrative job. (To be considered for Forty Plus membership, an individual is generally required to be at least 40 years of age, have earned above a specified salary in the last job (e.g., $15,000) and able to provide a number of character references.) Forty Plus members run their own organization and assist each other with their job serach.

Compared to the State Employment Service local offices, the senior non-profit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus) tend to attract a much higher proportion of those looking for post-retirement jobs to supplement other income.

Experiences of Employer Discrimination Because of Age

The majority of respondents (70%) who contacted employers as part of their recent job search felt that at least one of the employers they contacted was unwilling to consider them for a job simply because of their age. Those most likely to allege age discrimination by employers were males from the younger age group (55-64), and unemployed more than six months.

Belief by an individual that he is the victim of age discrimination often was not based on specific discriminatory acts by employers. In the interviews all those alleging employer age discrimination were pressed to cite a specific instance, and only one out of three could provide an example. In several of the examples cited, age was never mentioned by the employer. Those who could not cite specific discriminatory acts by employers were apparently basing their allegation of discrimination on the persistent difficulties they experienced in their job hunt.

Kinds of Employment Help Generally Wanted

Most survey respondents (75%) said that their primary need when they came to the employment office was for job leads. In pursuing these leads many wanted assistance in contacting employers, explaining their need was "someone to find and contact employers who might be interested in hiring me." A minority chose to handle all employer contacts themselves and marked their major need as "a list of job openings I can look over myself."

Many persons (40%) were also looking for understanding and personal attention -- "someone I can talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers." "Advice on how to deal with age discrimination" was also desired by many (35%).

Special Needs of Various Kinds of Older Job Seekers

Certain types of respondents -- women, long-term unemployed, and middle-aged job seekers -- had special needs as shown by the survey.

The majority of older female job seekers were single, separated, divorced, or widowed. One-third of the women reported that their spouse was deceased, compared to 6% of the men. Women more often mentioned a need for job training, reflecting the difficulties some women experience in entering or re-entering the full-time, paid job market after years as an unpaid homemaker and/or part-time worker.

The long-term unemployed people (those out of work and searching for a job more than six months) indicated special problems. Many lacked the confidence to find a job and felt they were victims of age discrimination. The long-term unemployed, compared to those unemployed a short time, tended to be looking for a professional, technical, or administrative job, reflecting the lack of openings, for senior level managers and professional people.

The younger age group (55 to 64) tended to report more urgent and pressing employment problems than the older group (65 or older). The younger group wanted more kinds of help from the employment office they visited and were more often dissatisfied with the help they received. They were usually looking for full-time work, and they more often reported that their family would have great difficulty in managing if they did not have work.

Degree of Satisfaction With Service of the Employment Office

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with the service in the employment office where they had received the survey questionnaire. About half of the respondents were unwilling to rate the employment help, marking "haven't received help yet so I can't really say." Most of those (86%) who rated the employment help indicated they were satisfied. The three different kinds of employment offices were rated the same.

In the interview, conducted two months after the initial survey with some individuals who had received their questionnaires at senior nonprofit offices, respondents evaluated the employment help they had received. They generally rated the help from the senior nonprofit offices "good" or "excellent." Those interviewed who had also visited a State Employment Service office typically rated this help "fair." Senior nonprofit employment offices were often praised for the personal attention and the effort the staff made to to help the older job applicant. The State Employment Service staff members were sometimes faulted as unhelpful and unresponsive.

Respondents who were interviewed evaluated how well particular needs were met by the senior nonprofit employment office where they had received their questionnaire. Most received the help they wanted in job leads and opportunity to talk with an understanding person. On the other hand, many of those wanting help with job training, information on jobs in other cities, and advice on age discrimination were disappointed.

Chapter 4

Study of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

As part of the analysis of employment services for older job seekers, Project OLDER WORKER included a study of senior nonprofit employment offices. The results of a survey of the directors of 60 senior nonprofit employment offices are presented in this chapter. The survey findings provide information on the following:

- The structure of senior nonprofit employment offices (funding sources, budget, staffing).
- Applicants to senior nonprofit employment offices (personal characteristics, how they learn about the nonprofit offices).
- Employers and the jobs available through nonprofit employment offices (sources of listings, the kinds of jobs listed and sought, employers' attitudes).
- Services provided to applicants.
- Relationships with State Employment Agencies.

During the study, project researchers visited a number of offices to interview staff members and to learn by observation how the offices functioned. Case studies describing these offices, plus several others that were studied through published materials and conference presentations, follow the survey results.

SCOPE OF THE STUDY

Scattered across the nation are some 80 voluntary nonprofit agencies specializing in employment services for the middle-aged and elderly. Because these employment offices are not mandated by law as the U.S. Employment Service System is, they are often called "voluntary," although many do receive Federal funds. In contrast to private commerical employment agencies, their services are free to both the job seeker and the employer, thus the label "nonprofit." In this chapter these offices will be referred to as senior nonprofit employment offices.

Linked only by a common purpose, the senior nonprofit employment offices do not form an organized service network. Each operates independently of the others, responding to the needs and characteristics of the community in which it is located.

The geographic dispersion of senior nonprofit employment offices follows no pattern. Florida, with its great concentration of retired people, has four senior nonprofit offices; yet other states with a disproportionately high elderly population are not equally served. Twenty-four states have no senior nonprofit employment offices. Often spawned as the brain child of the zealous and committed organizer, the senior nonprofit office is established wherever community economics, demographics, and enthusiasm mix in the right proportions.

For the most part, senior nonprofit employment offices attempt to place older job seekers into private sector or competitive government jobs. This is in contrast to government subsidized jobs created especially for older people by Title IX programs. This feature distinguishes the senior nonprofit employment offices from individual Title IX (SCSEP) programs that find temporary employment for economically-disadvantaged persons 55 and over. However, the distinction between the two kinds of employment service for the elderly is blurred by the fact that SCSEP programs must attempt to place at least 10% of their enrollees into unsubsidized jobs each year. Every SCSEP program to some degree performs a function similar to that of the senior nonprofit employment office. Now that a portion of Title IX funds are also being administered by state governments, often through the Area Agency on Aging, it becomes increasingly difficult to separate voluntary senior nonprofit employment offices from other public (government) agencies that provide an employment service in conjunction with other legally mandated services for the elderly (for example, nutrition and transportation).

One senior nonprofit office included in this study illustrates why strict definitions of such offices are difficult to formulate. The employment office is housed within a senior center supported by the United Way and Federal Older American's Act funds. The senior employment service, supported by funds from the State Division on Aging, originally placed applicants into unsubsidized employment. At the present time, the employment office also administrates a Title IX program and a CETA program, both of which place older workers into subsidized jobs.

The senior nonprofit employment offices chosen for this study are those listed in the Employment Resources for the Middle-Aged and Retired: The National Directory (1976). As pointed out in Chapter 2, the list is no longer current or exhaustive, but a sufficient number and variety of nonprofit employment services for the elderly are represented to form the subject of a study of their operations.

The two-part study consisted of (1) a mail survey of directors of senior nonprofit employment offices, and (2) case studies of selected nonprofit offices based on information gathered in interviews with office staff, presentations made by office spokespersons, and published materials.

The objectives of the study were:

1. To evaluate the services provided to older job seekers and senior nonprofit employment offices.
2. To learn about the job market for older persons from the perspective of the staff of employment services for the elderly.
3. To examine the cooperative relationships between senior nonprofit employment offices and other agencies serving the elderly, especially State Employment Security Agencies.
4. To learn about the diversity of service delivery models used by successful senior nonprofit employment offices.

SURVEY FINDINGS

The survey findings presented in this chapter are based on the responses of the directors of 60 senior nonprofit employment offices including seven Forty Plus organizations. Forty Plus organizations or "clubs" are a subgroup of senior nonprofit employment offices that share a name, a purpose and an approach to serving the middle-aged and older job seekers. However, each operates independently of the other. Forty Plus offices accept only applicants whose previous jobs are in the professional, managerial, or administrative field. In addition, at most Forty Plus offices the former salaries of their members must have exceeded a designated minimum set by each office. Because the Forty Plus "clubs" form a distinctly different category of senior nonprofit employment offices, their survey results are presented separately. Their inclusion with the results from the other senior nonprofit offices would have distorted the overall findings.

Structure of Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

History

The development of the senior nonprofit employment office is a relatively contemporary phenomenon. Only one-quarter of the offices surveyed were established 10 or more years ago and an equal number since 1974. In the period between 1971 and 1975, more than half (59%) of the senior nonprofit offices opened their doors. It is no coincidence that during this same period full-time older worker specialists at state and local levels of the State Employment Security Agency gradually disappeared. In 1969, the position of special assistant for older workers in the Office of the Secretary of Labor (U.S. Department of Labor) was abolished. As special attention for older job seekers at public (SESA) employment offices was de-emphasized, nonprofit organizations attempted to fill the resulting vacuum.

Forty Plus organizations have a longer history. Two of the responding offices were founded in the late 1930's and two more by 1960. The younger offices opened in 1971. Traditionally, the kinds of job seekers eligible to become members of Forty Plus clubs have sought assistance at public employment service offices proportionately less often than blue collar and service workers. Thus, the fluctuations in emphasis on special services to middle-aged and older workers at public employment offices would have relatively little impact on the growth of the Forty Plus employment offices.

Funding Sources

Respondents to the survey of senior nonprofit employment offices were asked to describe the one source from which they received most of their financial support. The wide range of responses is shown in Table 4.1. Government (Federal, state, and local) is the largest contributor, accounting for two-thirds of the responses. The Federal government appeared to be the major

Table 4.1

MAIN SOURCE OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

SOURCE OF SUPPORT	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=51)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
Federal Government		
CETA	22	0
Older American's Act	10	
Other Federal Sources	4	
State Government		
SESA	2	0
Office on Aging	4	
Other State Sources	4	
Local Government		
Area Agencies on Aging	6	0
Other Local Government Sources	14	
Local Nongovernment		
Membership Dues	6	100
Charities	10	
Service Organizations	6	
Other Local Sources	14	

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 2b, see page 170.

funding source for 36% of the offices. This figure probably underestimates the significance of Federal support because Federal programs such as CETA and those mandated by the various titles of the Older American's Act are usually administered by a local government body. The senior nonprofit employment offices that indicated their funds came from a local government source were in many cases receiving funds from CETA prime sponsors. Likewise, the Area Agency on Aging, named as the main support by 6% of the respondents were acting as points of distribution for Older American's Act appropriations.

A sizable minority (36%) of the senior nonprofit offices surveyed receive the bulk of their financial support from private sources. Charities, mainly the United Way, and local service organizations (YMCA) often with religious affiliations, fund 16% of all responding offices. Businesses, small foundations, and personal contributions ("other local sources") also back a significant share of the senior nonprofit employment offices. A few offices are self-supporting in that the job seekers or members provide operating funds through membership dues. Since applicants to nonprofit offices tend to represent the older, less affluent senior job seekers, only a handful of senior nonprofit offices can expect their clients to help pay for operating costs.

Forty Plus organizations on the other hand are funded solely through membership dues and in fact are often called "clubs." At the Forty Plus offices the members or job seekers work on a cooperative basis to assist each other in finding employment. This self-help approach demands that each member contribute money as well as time in order to perpetuate the organization. Because Forty Plus members have come from relatively highly paid, white-collar occupations, the dues are not prohibitive as they would be for most applicants to senior nonprofit offices.

Many respondents supplied supplementary information which indicated that funding from multiple sources is not unusual. A senior nonprofit employment office in the suburban Washington, D.C. area provides a typical example. The personnel department of the county government allocates a certain amount of money for basic operating expenses (supplies, part-time secretarial help). A grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare pays the salary of the full-time job developer.

In the Far West, a small senior nonprofit office operates in a similar manner. CETA funds one employee -- the director, while a county agency provides office space.

Another office responding to the survey cited no less than six funding sources: the county's United Way, the United Fund and Council of a nearby town, the County Office for the Aging, the County Office of Manpower and Development, and private foundations and individual contributions. The directors of senior nonprofit employment offices who hope to expand their services are undoubtedly forced to look beyond their original or primary sponsors for assistance.

The agency from which a senior nonprofit employment office receives its financial backing can have a direct influence on the longevity of that office. Offices funded under Title III (Section 308) of the Older American's Act are considered "model projects." They are funded for only a one-year period with further support contingent upon "availability of funds and acceptable evidence of satisfactory progress."

Local political maneuvering associated with the competition for funds from CETA prime sponsors can also affect the fortunes of the senior nonprofit employment offices. Directors must make sure that their services remain politically popular. Project researchers learned about one director who was so successful in public relations that a local politician insisted that the senior office open another branch in his district even though other areas of the city demonstrated a greater need.

Another survey respondent wrote that their employment service for the elderly had been drastically curtailed due to the expiration of a nonrefundable grant from the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The senior nonprofit employment office was part of a large voluntary vocational rehabilitation service that served a variety of rehabilitation clients. Under the grant the nonprofit organization had been able to expand its services to include the disabled elderly. For the severely disabled elderly a sheltered workshop was established, and for the older people with slight disabilities a job developer/placement counselor was hired to find competitive employment. The job developer's position terminated with the grant, and services for the more disabled group also suffered a cutback.

Table 4.1 does not reflect the extent to which "in kind" donations contribute to the maintenance of senior nonprofit offices. "In kind" support often includes office space, equipment, printing services, and so on. One respondent to the survey reported that his office had no source of financial support, but that the office space itself and the telephone were provided by the local community college. Another crucial source of nonfinancial support is the time of volunteer workers. The importance of volunteers to the operations of senior nonprofit employment offices will be discussed later in this chapter.

Size of Budget

The annual budgets of senior nonprofit employment offices for 1977 are given in Table 4.2. Except for illustrating the enormous variations in the resources available to the responding offices, these figures have meaning only in relation to the number of applicants served at each office, the number of paid staff vs. the number of volunteers, etc. There is a much stronger correlation between budget size and number of full-time or paid staff (.91) than between the budget and the total staff (.64). One-quarter (26%) of the respondents reported small budgets of less than $10,000. Indeed, two offices had no budget at all for 1977, relying entirely on volunteer staff and "in kind" donations. At the opposite extreme some six-figure budgets were reported. Since several of the offices with the largest budgets provide employment services to other disadvantaged persons as well as the elderly it

Table 4.2

TOTAL ANNUAL BUDGET IN 1977 FOR SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

ANNUAL BUDGET	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=49)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
Less than $1,000	4	0
$1,000 to $4,999	6	14
$5,000 to $9,999	16	0
$10,000 to $19,999	18	43
$20,000 to $49,999	31	14
$50,000 to $99,999	16	29
$100,000 to $199,999	2	0
$200,000 and over	6	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 2a, see page 170.

is possible that the reported budgets finance services for all groups. The middle 50% of offices operated with modest funds ranging in amount from $10,000-$50,000.

Staffing

A better measure of the magnitude of operations at senior nonprofit employment offices than size of budget is the size of the staff. Fully 75% of the responding offices have 10 or fewer staff members, and more than half of these offices (43% of the total) are run by five workers or less (Table 4.3). This information, considered in conjunction with the reported budgets, indicates that most senior nonprofit offices are rather small-scale operations. Even the minority of offices with seemingly huge staffs, one reproting as many as 200, are not as large as they might appear. Part-time and volunteer workers, as shown in Table 4.4, are responsible for a considerable share of the employment services to the elderly provided at senior nonprofit offices. More than one-third (36%) of responding offices are staffed entirely by part-time workers and half report a part-time workforce of at least three-quarters of the total. Only 13% of all offices have no part-time personnel. These offices are usually staffed by just one or two people.

Volunteers, many of whom work part-time, appear to be essential to the continued existance of senior nonprofit employment offices. Sixty percent of the offices are assisted by volunteers, and more than 40% have a staff composed of more volunteer workers than paid employees. With few exceptions, the employment offices that serve the greatest number of applicants also rely most heavily of the services of volunteers. An outstanding example of what can be accomplished with a volunteer staff is a nonprofit office that serves the older job seeker from 15 separate branch locations. Two hundred of the 234 staff members are volunteers. According to the director of this office volunteers are valuable, not only for the duties they perform at the office, but also for their contacts in the community. The more volunteers associated with the enterprise, the more members of the community (both employers and job seekers) will learn firsthand about the employment service. At no cost, volunteers can generate job listings, applicants, and public good will.

At Forty Plus organizations where the job seekers also function as the office staff, there are few if any paid full-time workers. Active Forty Plus members (usually those who are unemployed) must spend at least one day a week working on one of the Forty Plus committees to which they have been assigned. Each committee assists fellow job seekers in a particular way. Typically, there will be a counseling committee (to help develop resumes, interview techniques) a marketing committee (to perform job market research, develop brochures), a position research committee (to match skills with jobs, maintain a register of skills of all members), and a membership committee. Unless active members devote the required time to committee assignments, they may be dropped from the club roles. Thus, the staff of a Forty Plus office is as big as the list of active members.

Table 4.3

PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES[a] BY SIZE OF STAFF

PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT OFFICES	Size of Staff
43	1 to 5
32	6 to 10
13	11 to 20
8	21 to 50
6	51 and over

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 4a, see page 170.

Table 4.4

PERCENT OF TOTAL STAFF CONSISTING OF PART-TIME WORKERS AND VOLUNTEER WORKERS BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT OFFICES[a]

PERCENT OF TOTAL STAFF	Percent of Senior Nonprofit Offices With: (N=53)	
	Part-Time Workers	Volunteer Workers
100	36	9
76 to 99	24	13
51 to 75	11	23
26 to 50	11	9
1 to 25	4	6
0	13	40

---

[a] Based on responses to survey items 4b, c, and d, see page 170. For this item respondents were not asked to give mutually exclusive responses. Part-time workers may also be volunteers and vice-versa.

Number of Applicants

The information in Table 4.5 on the average number of new applicants per month again illustrates how difficult it is to characterize the typical senior nonprofit employment office. The office that serves 10 or fewer new job seekers in a month is as common as the office that receives 10 times as many new applicants in that time. Three senior nonprofit offices reported a monthly average of more than 100 new older applicants, but two of these offices (each counted as one location in the tabulation of results) have multiple branches. The office that reported serving the greatest number of older people (400 in one month) had 15 separate branch offices. However, one single location office in a western tourist town reports serving 200 senior job seekers each month. This impressive record was accomplished with only six staff members and a budget of $50,000.

Table 4.5

AVERAGE NUMBER OF NEW APPLICANTS PER MONTH BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

NUMBER OF NEW APPLICANTS	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=51)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
1 to 10	12	50
11 to 20	29	17
21 to 30	22	17
31 to 40	4	17
41 to 50	4	0
51 to 75	12	0
76 to 100	12	0
101 to 150	2	0
151 to 200	2	0
More than 200	2	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 7, see page 170.

A puzzling aspect of the findings is the lack of strong correlation between the number of new applicants per month and both the size of the budget (.33) and the total number of staff (.50). Some senior nonprofit employment offices appear to be able to handle a large volume of job seekers on a relatively small budget, while others report a low number of monthly applicants and a larger office staff and yearly budget. At 15% of the responding offices, the total number of office workers equals or exceeds the number of new applicants per month. At an additional 10% of the offices, the ratio of new applicants to workers is two to one, or less. Without knowing such factors as the variety of scope of services provided to each applicant, the number of hours each staff member works, and the proportion of repeat applicants, it is not possible to explain these differences.

Applicants to Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

Personal Characteristics

Age

Since senior nonprofit employment offices are established for the purpose of serving the older job seeker, it is not surprising that applicants 55 and older constitute the preponderance of their clients. Table 4.6, however, shows that slightly more than one-quarter of the responding offices serve at least some younger applicants. One office, for example, funded by CETA, was required to serve unemployed and disadvantaged persons over 40 in addition to job seekers aged 55 or more. Another nonprofit office that specialized in helping displaced homemakers become self-sufficient has a lower age limit of 35 years.

Table 4.6

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS IN THREE AGE GROUPS BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS	Percent Senior Nonprofit			Percent Forty Plus		
	Under 55 (N=51)	55 to 64 (N=52)	65 & Over (N=50)	Under 55 (N=7)	55 to 64 (N=6)	65 & Over (N=6)
A Few (0-15%)	73	10	16	0	33	83
Some (16-40%)	14	29	32	14	50	17
Half (41-60%)	4	36	36	57	17	0
Many (61-85%)	8	21	14	14	0	0
Most (86-100%)	2	4	2	14	0	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 8, see page 170.

In contrast, 52% of the respondents reported that at least half of their applicants are 65 and over. The results of the survey of job seekers presented earlier in this report showed that the respondents who had sought employment assistance from senior nonprofit employment offices, when compared to applicants to State Employment Security Offices, were, on the whole, older, more interested in part-time work, were willing to accept a lower minimum hourly pay, and were better able to manage financially if they did not work. The older person, who is of post-retirement age and probably receiving a pension or Social Security benefits and who is seeking work to supplement that income, is the kind of person likely to turn to the senior nonprofit office for employment assistance.

Applicants to Forty Plus organizations on the other hand are rarely over 65. Six of the seven Forty Plus office directors reported that at least half of their members were less than 55 years old. Indeed, the director of one Forty Plus office stated that job seekers over 60 are discouraged from applying because the major corporations likely to hire the Forty Plus executives begin to retire their own employees at that age.

Sex and Race

Table 4.7 shows that senior nonprofit offices serve approximately equal numbers of male and female applicants. But almost three-quarters of these offices indicate that many or most of their clients are white. The remaining quarter have a nonwhite clientele of 16-60%. These figures cannot show whether or not racial minorities are applying to senior nonprofit offices in proportion to their numbers in the older job-seeking population.

Table 4.7

PROPORTION OF WHITE, MALE APPLICANTS BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS	Percent Senior Nonprofit		Percent Forty Plus	
	Male (N=50)	White (N=46)	Male (N=7)	White (N=7)
A Few (0-15%)	10	2	0	0
Some (16-40%)	30	4	0	0
Half (41-60%)	52	20	0	0
Many (61-85%)	8	41	14	0
Most (86-100%)	0	33	86	100

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 8, see page 171.

As expected, the survey results show that white males form the overwhelming majority of the applicants to Forty Plus organizations. The occupational and income requirements for membership exclude most female job seekers over 40. As the increasing numbers of women who are now entering professional, executive, and managerial careers mature, the patterns of Forty Plus membership should change.

Not all Forty Plus organizations are equally rigid in their entrance requirements, however. A respondent to the job seeker survey told how she had convinced the Forty Plus club in her city that she should be admitted even though she had held no paid professional or managerial job since the beginning of her 20-year marriage. Finding herself divorced and in need of an income she persuaded the membership committee that her many years of managing fund-raising drives and public relations for local civic causes on a volunteer basis constituted a valuable and genuine work history. Once a Forty Plus member, the woman then became the leader of the organization's own public relations committee. At the other extreme, one large-city Forty Plus organization accepts only one or two applicants out of every 10 after contacting no fewer than eight references. This organization admitted its first black member last year.

Education

Table 4.8 presents the range of educational levels of applicants to senior nonprofit employment offices. The typical applicant appears to be a high school graduate although almost one-third of the offices reported that half of their applicants had not completed high school. Most offices indicated

---

Table 4.8

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS IN THREE EDUCATIONAL GROUPS BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

	Percent Senior Nonprofit			Percent Forty Plus		
PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS	Less Than High Sch. (N=47)	High Sch. Grad. (N=47)	College Grad. (N=48)	Less Than High Sch.	High Sch. Grad. (N=7)	College Grad.
A Few (0-15%)	30	17	67	100	43	0
Some (16-40%)	28	28	29	0	57	0
Half (41-60%)	32	43	2	0	0	0
Many (61-85%)	6	8	2	0	0	29
Most (86-100%)	4	4	0	0	0	71

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 8, see page 171.

that only a few of their clients were college graduates. Correspondingly, senior nonprofit offices received fewer applications from older job seekers whose previous jobs were in a white-collar field than from job seekers who had not been in white-collar occupations (Table 4.9). Again the responses from Forty Plus organizations are diametrically opposite. Among these applicants a college education is the norm and a former white-collar job mandatory.

Table 4.9

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS WHO PREVIOUSLY HELD WHITE-COLLAR JOB BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=48)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
A Few (0-15%)	25	0
Some (16-40%)	31	0
Half (41-60%)	21	0
Many (61-85%)	17	0
Most (86-100%)	6	100

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 8, see page 171.

Part-time work is the clear preference of the older job seekers applying to senior nonprofit employment offices as shown in Table 4.10. Just as clearly, Forty Plus members are looking for full-time positions.

As the figures in the preceding tables have also demonstrated, senior nonprofit employment offices and Forty Plus organizations each serve distinctly different applicant groups. The job seeker who is at least 55 years old and maybe 10 years older, who is beyond the age of seriously considering a second career, whose formal education stopped at high school graduation, and whose life's work was probably not in a professional or managerial field, could be the "typical" applicant to the senior nonprofit employment office. (Naturally, this generalization does not always hold.) The Forty Plus applicant, on the other hand, may be 15 to 25 years away from the usual and often criticized retirement age of 65. Although this person probably earned more at his/her previous job than the senior nonprofit office applicant, the Forty

Plus member is less likely to have alternative sources of income such as a pension or Social Security. Thus, full-time employment is the goal of this job seeker.

Table 4.10

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS SEEKING PART-TIME WORK BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

PROPORTION OF APPLICANTS	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=51)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
A Few (0-15%)	4	86
Some (16-40%)	2	14
Half (41-60%)	18	0
Many (61-85%)	35	0
Most (86-100%)	41	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 8., see page 171.

How Applicants Learn About Senior Nonprofit Employment Offices

With only 80 senior nonprofit employment offices scattered across the country it is likely that most of the four million older people who are interested in working have never heard of the services offered by these offices. "Outreach," as it is often called, is a major concern at many nonprofit employment offices. Earlier in this report is was stated that older job seekers are more likely to be unemployed for longer periods and to give up their job search because of discouragement. The director of one inner city employment office told project researchers that the disadvantaged elderly were particularly difficult to reach. The techniques that bring the middle-class job seeker to the senior nonprofit offices -- spot advertising on radio and TV, brochures, talks to civic groups -- are ineffective with the very low income elderly. Since this group perhaps needs income from employment more than any other, outreach campaigns must include them.

Table 4.11 shows what the respondents to the office survey consider to be the most common way applicants learn about their senior nonprofit offices.

Advertising, the most sophisticated method, is only slightly more effective than word of mouth in attracting applicants. Senior citizen groups also help publicize the employment services. Because the employment offices are nonprofit organizations performing a "worthwhile" function, their advertising is usually of the public service variety. While the cost to the employment office may be negligible, the effort is not. Office directors told project staff, during personal visits, how a great deal of their time is spent in public relations aimed at convincing the local media that their cause deserves air time as much as all the other competing public service organizations. "Human interest" stories in local newspapers are also considered an important means of exposure.

Table 4.11

METHODS BY WHICH APPLICANTS LEARN ABOUT SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

METHODS	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=52)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
Referred By SESA[b]	4	0
Word of Mouth	35	43
Referred By Other Employment Agencies	2	0
Advertising	42	57
Senior Citizen Groups	10	0
Other	8	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 9, see page 171.

[b] State Employment Security Agency local offices.

The senior nonprofit office in a western tourist town that reported receiving 200 new applicants a month provides an excellent example of how local media can be utilized to the fullest extent. The office places a weekly column in the Sunday newspaper and produces a weekly "senior TV newscast." In addition, the office benefits from continuing television and radio public service announcements. The director wrote in a letter, "As a result we have strong community support." It is also true that he must have worked hard to gain enough support to receive that much publicity from the community.

Advertising, while often very successful, is an indirect way of reaching the older job seeker. One senior nonprofit office has experimented with more direct techniques. Older worker "registration days" (publicized in advance) were held at libraries, churches, YMCAs, shopping centers, and neighborhood centers. The older job seekers who registered at the local center by filling out a card were later contacted by an employment office volunteer to set up a specific appointment. According to the employment office director, registration days "brought us the more sophisticated applicant." Different methods were used with disadvantaged older people in the inner city. The nonprofit employment office enlisted the support of churches where announcements about the employment office were made to the congregation. In the course of their visits social workers delivered brochures directly to homes. Finally, employment office volunteers that resided in the low-income areas tried to recruit applicants from their own neighborhoods.

Only a fraction of the responding office directors reported that SESA offices were a common source of information on senior nonprofit offices. Perhaps SESA local office staff members are not aware of the senior nonprofit offices in their areas, or they may be reluctant to make referrals for other reasons.

Employers and Jobs

Sources of Job Listings

All survey respondents reported that their offices maintained a file of job listings. Obtaining job listings, as well as recruiting applicants, is crucial to the success of the employment office. The community support and public relations efforts so important in attracting applicants are even more essential in securing the cooperation of local businesses. Table 4.12 shows the sources of job listings used at the senior nonprofit employment offices responding to the survey. The figures in Table 4.12 represent the percentage of offices that checked each listing source rather than how frequently that source was used at each office. The results show that almost all offices (94%) obtain at least some job openings from employers who list those jobs with the office. Job development, an activity in which a staff member (job developer) directly solicits jobs from employers and encourages them to create openings suitable for older people, yields job listings for nearly 75% of the responding offices.

Senior nonprofit offices also take advantage of job vacancy listings complied by others. About one-third of the responding offices referred to government vacancy notices and more than one-half scan the help-wanted advertisements like those that appear in newspapers. Another third of the respondents claimed that their offices secured job listings from SESA local offices, but only 4% stated that the SESA was the most common source of applicant referrals. As a rule senior nonprofit offices do not have close ties with the State Employment Service, although there are several important exceptions. These will be discussed later in the chapter.

Forty Plus offices demonstrate the same reliance on employers and job development as direct sources of job listings. Government job vacancy job notices assume more importance since these openings tend to be for full-time career positions. The "old boy network" also notifies Forty Plus organizations of suitable job openings. Former members who have found employment are encouraged to pass on information about upcoming vacancies in their new company.

Table 4.12

SOURCES OF JOB LISTINGS AT SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

SOURCE	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=53)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
SESA[b]	30	0
Employers	94	100
Job Development	74	71
Government Job Vacancy Notices	34	57
Want Ads	57	29
Other Sources	23	43

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 10, see page 171.

[b] State Employment Security Agency local offices.

Before employers list job openings with a senior nonprofit employment office or a Forty Plus organization, that office has undoubtedly devoted considerable effort to public relations, advertising, or some activity designed to increase community awareness. Usually, the advertising that helps to recruit new applicants is also aimed at employers.

Office directors must establish and maintain relationships with local civic organizations and clubs where employers congregate (for example, Rotary, Chamber of Commerce, Kiwanis). Above all they must use imagination to attract the employer's attention and have convincing arguments to persuade the employer that hiring the older worker is "good business." An understanding of the businessman's habits and thinking is also an indispensable tool. The director of the same office that held registration days to attract new applicants wrote, "One of the most effective [methods] in developing jobs was the announcements in the church bulletins. One retired publicist said community-minded businessmen go to church and have nothing else to read while waiting for the service to begin." The "marketing approach," successfully employed by another senior nonprofit office director, is described in detail in Appendix B.

"Senior job fairs" are yet another technique that has been used to educate employers on the positive qualities of older workers and to solicit openings.

Employers' Attitudes Toward the Older Worker

Survey respondents were asked to rate employers on their receptiveness to hiring older workers. The ratings presented in Table 4.13 show why senior employment office staff members feel they must educate the business community about the advantages of the older employee. Only 19% of respondents from senior nonprofit offices labeled employers as "generally receptive." Almost half of the respondents called employers "generally reluctant" and another third felt that employers were more or less evenly divided in their attitudes toward the older worker. Perhaps because their members are younger than most senior nonprofit employment office applicants, respondents from Forty Plus organizations thought employers somewhat less reluctant to hire the older person.

Table 4.13

PERCEPTION BY SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS OF EMPLOYERS' RECEPTIVENESS TO HIRING OLDER WORKERS

EMPLOYERS' RECEPTIVENESS	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=48)	Percent Forty Plus (N=6)
Generally Receptive	19	17
Generally Reluctant	48	17
Evenly Divided	33	67

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 13, see page 172.

Large companies, companies with retirement rules and pension plans, and government agencies were frequently cited as being reluctant to hire older workers. Unionized employers and businesses managed by young executives were also noted for their unwillingness to consider the elderly job seeker. The directors of several senior nonprofit offices told project researchers that they do not bother to approach large corporate employers with requests to hire older workers. When a firm pensions off its own employees by age 65 there is little reason to expect that firm to hire a new employee who is in that age range.

An ingenious plan for overcoming the retirement policy barrier developed at one senior nonprofit employment office is described on page 189 in Appendix B.

Besides retirement policies and union restrictions, respondents reported that employers had a multitude of excuses for not wanting to hire older people: older people are overqualified for our jobs; older people are undereducated or lack the modern training for our jobs; older people are not suited for physically demanding jobs; older people are insurance liabilities.

Kinds of Jobs Listed by Employers and Kinds of Jobs Sought by Applicants

For both senior nonprofit employment offices and Forty Plus organizations the kinds of jobs listed most often by employers parallel closely the kinds of jobs most often sought by older applicants (Table 4.14). At senior nonprofit employment offices the greatest demand is for household workers, service workers, and clercial workers. Skilled craftsmen are also sought after although to a lesser extent. For the most part the jobs listed at senior nonprofit offices tend to be those that require little formal education or training, that fit into part-time schedules, that offer low pay, and that are typical of smaller individual employers. Many of these jobs could also be temporary and suited to the older person who wanted to supplement other incomes rather than rely on the job as a sole source of support.

Jobs for which more education or training is necessary (professional, technical, administrative) or jobs usually found in large companies (machine operatives) are offered infrequently by employers and requested with equal infrequence by job seekers.

Even though employers list the same kinds of jobs that older seekers want, the quality of the openings does not always meet the standards of the senior nonprofit employment office. In interviews with office directors, project researchers learned that some employers, both individuals and firms, try to exploit the older worker. They offer menial jobs for less than the minimum wage hoping that the older person will be grateful for any job. Positions for live-in housekeepers or companions can be particularly troublesome because the duties are often undefined or open ended, require a great deal of physical strength and leave little time for the older worker's personal life.

Rather than wait for employers to list job openings, several nonprofit employment offices advertise a corps of workers that perform specialized services. "Handyman services" are offered by offices that have a roster of skilled craftsmen. Homeowners, for instance, needing a painter or carpenter contact the nonprofit office for individual jobs. During the income tax season one nonprofit office advertises the services of the retired accountants registered with that office. At one Forty Plus organization a group of members with diverse research and management backgrounds have formed a consultant service. The organization markets this service just as a consulting firm would. An added benefit is that a Forty Plus member is occasionally offered a permanent position after acting as a temporary consultant.

As expected, Table 4.14 shows that the jobs most often listed and sought at Forty Plus organizations are those in the professional, technical and administrative categories.

Table 4.14

TYPES OF JOB OPENINGS BY FREQUENCY OF DEMAND BY PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

TYPE OF JOB	Percent Senior Nonprofit Most Often Listed (N=52)	 Least Often Listed (N=50)	 Most Often Sought (N=52)	Percent Forty Plus Most Often Listed (N=7)	 Least Often Listed (N=5)	 Most Often Sought (N=7)
Professional	0	24	2	24	7	24
Technical	2	12	2	29	7	29
Managerial-Administrative	2	18	4	33	0	33
Sales	6	2	6	14	0	14
Clerical	21	0	25	0	13	0
Crafts	12	3	12	0	20	0
Machine Operative	0	14	0	0	0	0
Transportation Operative	3	1	2	0	0	0
Laborer	6	5	8	0	7	0
Household Worker	30	0	24	0	13	0
Service Worker	19	0	15	0	13	0
Farm Worker	0	20	0	0	20	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey items 11 and 12 in which respondents were asked to give the three types of job most often and least often listed and most often sought. See page 172.

Services Provided to Applicants

The primary purpose of senior nonprofit employment offices is to provide employment assistance to older job seekers. However, older people often have age-related problems that must be treated before they can be successfully placed in a job. Some organizations, called senior nonprofit offices in this survey, are only a part of a larger agency providing a wide range of services to older people. Problems with health, housing, adequate nutrition, transportation, and Social Security and Medicare payments are not unusual in the low-income elderly.

Table 4.15 gives the survey results on the proportion of office time actually devoted to employment assistance. Seventy-two percent of the responding offices spend almost full time for this purpose. But a significant minority of offices devote considerable effort to meeting other needs of older people.

Table 4.15

PROPORTION OF OFFICE TIME SPENT ON EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE AT SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

OFFICE TIME	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=53)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
Almost All	72	71
Three-Quarters	13	14
Less Than Half	15	14

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 3, see page 170.

Employment assistance for older people encompasses a diversity of individual services. Respondents were asked to indicate what proportion of applicants to their offices received various services. The results for services provided to most or all applicants are given in Table 4.16.

The kinds of employment help given older job seekers by the largest percentages of senior nonprofit offices has a common characteristic. The job seeker plays a relatively passive role. The employment office staff matches applicants' qualifications to jobs at 91% of responding offices, whereas at only 24% of the offices are the applicants themselves given a list of job openings. Nearly two-thirds (64%) of the offices staff members talk to employers on behalf of the applicant. A minority of offices help

Table 4.16

SERVICES PROVIDED TO MOST OR ALL APPLICANTS AT SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS[a]

SERVICES	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=53)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
Develop Job Openings	36	71
Match Applicants' Qualifications To Jobs	91	71
Provide List Of Job Openings	24	100
Talk To Employer On Behalf Of Applicant	64	57
Test And Assess Applicants' Abilities	19	14
Advise Or Inform About Job Training	13	14
Provide Training On Job Skills	4	0
Counsel On Job Choice	55	71
Counsel On Personal Problems	15	14
Refer To Social Service Agencies	7	0
Assist In Applying For Benefits	7	0
Provide Information On How To Apply For Jobs	34	86
Provide Training On How To Apply For Jobs	6	100
Give Advice On Dealing With Age Discrimination	23	86
Give Advice On Finding Good Job Leads	36	86
Provide Classes On Post-Retirement Planning	2	0
Follow Up After Job Referral	85	43
Follow Up After Person Has Been On The Job	57	29
Other	7	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 17, see page 173.

older job seekers develop the skills that would permit them, in turn, to conduct an independent job search. About one-third (34%) give information on how to apply for jobs and just 6% actually provide training on how to apply for jobs. Advice on how to find good job leads and how to deal with age discrimination is not commonly given.

From the results it is apparent that few offices are equipped to provide testing, training, or advice on the development of new job skills. Although more than half (55%) counsel applicants on their choice of future jobs, the results from the survey of job seekers given earlier tend to support the notion that applicants to senior nonprofit offices prefer to rely on office staff to take charge of their job search.

Forty Plus organizations, which operate on the principle of self-help, provide a different cluster of services consistent with this principle. All Forty Plus organizations provide a list of job openings, and all give training on how to apply for jobs. The other most frequently provided services are also of the kind that help job seekers develop skills so that they can conduct their own job search more effectively. Most offices provide information on how to apply for jobs, give advice on how to deal with age discrimination and give advice on finding good job leads. Standard assistance, such as counseling on job choice and matching of applicant's qualifications to jobs, is also offered by the majority of Forty Plus organizations.

Another contrast in services between senior nonprofit offices and Forty Plus offices is the extent to which they engage in job development. Five of the seven (71%) of the Forty Plus respondents reported that their offices develop jobs for most or all members. Apparently, Forty Plus members cannot expect employers to advertise or list the kinds of openings they seek -- highly paid white-collar jobs. An aggressive approach is required in which the individual job seeker must "sell" his/her particular skills to the employer. In this context, the emphasis at Forty Plus organizations on training members how to look for a job can be understood. Only 36% of the senior nonprofit offices develop job openings for most or all of their applicants. The kinds of jobs most often listed at these offices -- clerical, household services, and services outside the household -- are not usually created around the unique skills of an individual. When the employment office applicant plays a relatively passive role in the job search process employment offices would need enormous staffs in order to engage in extensive job development.

Relationships With State Employment Security Agencies

Both the senior nonprofit employment office and SESA local office must serve the older job seeker at no cost to that individual. Their goals in relation to the older person are similar: obtaining appropriate listings and making a satisfactory job placement. Although the two organizations have common objectives they do not frequently interact. Table 4.17 shows that few nonprofit offices have regular dealings with the SESA. More offices report referring applicants to the SESA (23%) than any other form of cooperation. But only half this many offices (11%) report that they receive frequent referrals from the SESA.

Table 4.17

PERCENT OF SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES AND FORTY PLUS ORGANIZATIONS REPORTING FREQUENT INTERACTIONS WITH THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE (SESA)[a]

TYPE OF INTERACTION WITH THE SESA	Percent Senior Nonprofit (N=53)	Percent Forty Plus (N=7)
SESA Refers Applicants To Senior Nonprofit Office/ Forty Plus Office	11	0
Senior Nonprofit Office/ Forty Plus Office Refers Applicants To SESA	23	14
Senior Nonprofit Office/ Forty Plus Office And SESA Exchange Information On The Job Market	17	14
Senior Nonprofit Office/ Forty Plus Office Exchange Information On Older Job Seekers	19	0
SESA Advises On The Operations Of Senior Nonprofit Office/Forty Plus Office	2	0
Other Interactions Between Senior Nonprofit Office/ Forty Plus Office And SESA	9	0

---

[a] Based on responses to survey item 18 (interactions reported as occurring often or very often). See page 173.

There is a senior nonprofit employment office located in New York State which does have close ties with the SESA local office. This office could well serve as a model of cooperation between older worker programs. The State Employment Service provides office space and use of its computerized job bank. (The SESA local office and the senior nonprofit office are located in the same building.) The office is partially staffed by volunteers in the Retired Senior Volunteer Program (a Federal program sponsored by ACTION). Funding for the office is provided through a contract with the County Manpower Planning Services agency (a CETA prime contractor), and direction in office operations is given by a special advisory committee of representatives of interested groups in the community (churches, etc.). Finally, the office is sponsored by a branch of the local United Way concerned exclusively with older people.

Even where there is interaction or a relationship between a senior nonprofit employment office and a local SESA office it is not always mutually beneficial. The director of one senior nonprofit office told project researchers that even though the two offices share the same floor in the same building, the senior nonprofit office rarely receives referrals from the SESA. The director of another nonprofit office had a different point of view. She did not look forward to referrals from the SESA office because these older job seekers were usually "rejects" with alcohol problems and other social handicaps.

Only one of the Forty Plus organizations responding to the survey interacts regularly with the local SESA office. But their relationship is close. The SESA provides the Forty Plus organization with office space, supplies and franking privileges. The SESA also shares its job listings although they are rarely useful to the professional and managerial membership of the Forty Plus club. Project researchers were informed by the office director that members from other Forty Plus organizations look down on this club because of its lack of elitism and its association with the Public Employment Service. The greatest potential for cooperation between the two types of employment office appears to be in the referral of applicants based on the knowledge of the specialized service each kind of office provides.

SUMMARY

The survey results (excluding those on Forty Plus organizations) reflect the fact that each senior nonprofit employment office functions independently from all other nonprofit offices. The findings on office structure -- sources of funding, size of budget, staffing arrangements, and number of applicants served -- allow no generalizations. But, with few exceptions, senior nonprofit offices attract applicants with similar personal backgrounds and offer similar kinds of jobs.

According to employment office directors, their applicants tend to be at least 55 years old, often over 65. There is an equal number of men and women. They are usually high school graduates. However, there are more applicants who did not graduate from high school than there are those who attended college. Their previous employment, if any, was not likely to be in a professional, technical, or managerial capacity. They prefer part-time work to full-time.

These findings corroborate those of the job seeker survey in which applicants to senior nonprofit offices tended to be of post-retirement age and could manage without the income from a job. (That is, they were probably looking for work in order to supplement other retirement income.)

The jobs most often listed and most often sought at senior nonprofit employment offices fall into the categories of household services, services outside the household, clerical, and skilled crafts. Many of the available jobs do not require formal training and, consequently, pay is low. They are generally the kinds of jobs likely to be offered by small businesses or individuals.

Only one-fifth of the survey respondents characterized employers as "generally receptive" to hiring older workers. Large companies with pension plans and retirement policies were most often cited for their negative attitudes.

About three out of four of the offices surveyed specialize in providing employment assistance to the older clients. The services available to the majority of applicants at most senior nonprofit offices generally lead directly to job referrals and placement: the burden of the job search is born mainly by employment office staff. Training in how to conduct an independent job search and advice or training on new job skills are not given at most offices.

A minority of senior nonprofit employment offices have close working relationships with local offices of the State Employment Security Agency. Only 11% of the respondents reported that SESA local offices frequently refer applicants to the nonprofit office, and as a source of job listings SESA offices ranked fifth out of six alternatives. Furthermore, not even one in five senior nonprofit offices exchanges, with any degree of frequency, information on older job seekers or the job market.

On nearly every dimension, the results from Forty Plus organizations contradict the findings for senior nonprofit employment offices. The homogeneity of the membership is assured by strict admission policies that screen out all those job seekers who have not held well paid, white-collar positions. There are no staff members to place Forty Plus members in jobs. Rather, the members coach each other on how to conduct a fruitful job search. Forty Plus organizations emphasize training applicants how to "sell" their unique combination of experience and skills to employers.

CASE STUDIES OF SELECTED SENIOR NONPROFIT EMPLOYMENT OFFICES

The following case studies of seven senior nonprofit employment offices are based on information from several sources. Project researchers had the opportunity to interview the directors and other staff members of some senior nonprofit offices. A few office directors who responded to the survey provided valuable additional information about the functioning of their programs for older workers. Conferences on older worker employment were another means by which project researchers learned about particular senior nonprofit offices.

An individual case study is not intended to give a comprehensive account of the operations of that office, nor do all the combined case studies give an accurate overall picture of the operations at all senior nonprofit employment offices. Rather, the case studies illustrate the variety of organizational frameworks, client groups served, methods of securing community support, and successes and problems that characterize some senior nonprofit offices.

Office A

Office A claims to be the nation's oldest employment service for older people. Because it is located in a middle- to-upper-middle-class commuter suburb of a large city, applicants to the office include retired stock brokers and accountants as well as widowed homemakers and retired blue collar workers. The local employers range from some of the country's largest corporations to small businesses and the individual businessmen typical of any town.

Perhaps the proximity of Office A to a business and financial capital inspired the office director to develop his "marketing approach" to operating a senior employment service. The essence of the marketing approach is to convince the public, including employers, that hiring the older worker is good business. The annual report for Office A points out that if each person who had found work through Office A earned the maximum allowed by the Social Security income ceiling, more than $2 million would have been returned to the local economy. According to the office director the roster of older workers is a good product that must be properly marketed.

Rather than appealing to the employer's conscience ("Do a good turn by hiring the older person".), Office A appeals to the employer's business sense by offering a needed service at a competitive price. An excellent example is the temporary and manpower service it recently established. The new service is advertised, and it functions in the same way as a profit-making temporary personnel agency. But because Office A is a nonprofit organization the hourly rates are lower.

This service helps older workers secure good jobs, although temporary, in large companies whose retirement policies would normally preclude the employment of post-retirement aged workers.

Like commercial agencies, Office A puts the temporary workers on its own payroll. In effect, it rents a service to businesses that require temporary manpower.

Office B

Office B, located in a small city, demonstrates how the limited resources of a small but tightly knit community can be brought together to create a successful senior nonprofit employment service.

Community support for the senior employment service was first generated in a church where a representative from the local State Employment Security Agency (SESA) office and United Way agency spoke to the members. The SESA donated office space and equipment in the Employment Security Building, and members of the church staffed the office on a voluntary basis. The volunteers are now older people in the Retired Seniors Volunteers Program (ACTION), and a CETA grant pays for a full-time office director. A branch of the local United Way concerned with older people serves as the sponsor of the office, and the County Office on Aging publicizes the office's services in its newsletter for older people.

In addition to housing the senior nonprofit employment office, the SESA office permits access to the computerized job bank. When the SESA office gets a job listing that is especially suited to an older worker, it informs the nonprofit office before entering the job in the job bank. If an applicant to

Office B is interested in a job bank opening he/she is then sent to the SESA office for job referral. Also, older applicants to the SESA office are routinely informed of the services at Office B. While Office B is not an official older worker unit within the State Employment Service, the two employment services are able to assist older job seekers better by sharing their resources.

Office C

Because of the imagination and energy of its director and staff, Office C is a remarkably successful nonprofit employment office. With a staff of more than 230 (200 of whom are volunteers), at 14 suburban satellite offices, and an inner city headquarters, this organization found jobs for nearly 3,000 older people between May, 1976 and April, 1977. The earlier discussion of the office survey results contains numerous references to the effective methods employed by Office C to recruit applicants, win employer support, and raise community awareness.

However, Office C was not an overnight success. After the first year of operation at the single downtown location, the staff of the small office was disappointed with their performance. It was the analysis of the first year's difficulties that inspired the formulation of the ambitious plans to open branch offices throughout the city. One difficulty noted was that while many older people wanted work, they lacked transportation. Further, the office organizers realized that business and community support was essential to obtaining enough desirable job listings.

The concept of satellite offices helped solve both problems. Each branch office would be located near a main transportation artery in neighborhoods where there were concentrations of older people. Since the establishment of each satellite office depended entirely on neighborhood support, community involvement was built in. In the areas chosen for the satellite offices, community organizations of all kinds were asked to participate by donating office space, serving as volunteers, etc. Volunteers not only worked in the offices interviewing applicants and performing clerical tasks, but also, in an incidental way, they acted as spokespersons for the employment office. Volunteers generated applicants and job listings through their everyday contacts in their own communities. Without the experience of the first disappointing year, Office C might not have become the model senior nonprofit employment service it is now.

Office D

When a senior nonprofit employment office lacks a suitable location, adequate staff, and community support, the result is a depressing contrast to the offices just described. Office D is part of a government-financed community center with a "comprehensive senior citizens program that provides multiservice for the elderly." It is located in an extremely low-income, urban neighborhood. The salaries of the three staff members are paid out of community center funds. Some operating expenses are also covered. But additional support must come from in kind donations. Perhaps because the needs of the older people served by the community center are more immediate than employment (housing and nutrition, for example) the employment function of the center is neglected.

The employment office is not housed in the same building as the community center. Instead, it is on the second floor of a dilapidated row house on a street lined with similar structures, some of them abandoned. There are no nearby shops or public gathering places that would attract older people to this location for any other purpose. There is no sign at the door to identify the employment office. Only a street number appears above the door. Inside is a steep, narrow staircase, and again there are no signs to guide the older applicant. But since there are no doors off the hallway the stairs lead only to the employment office.

The second floor rooms in which the employment office is located are small and decrepit. On the winter day when project researchers visited the office the only heat came from a gas cooking stove with all four burners lit. At several points, the interview was interrupted by a mouse running between the file cabinets and doorway. It is not surprising that this office receives, on the average, only five new applicants each month. No older person would realize that this building is a place to go for help. It is difficult to justify the existence of such a place, either in terms of cost effectiveness or in the implied attitude of its sponsors towards the older people expected to go there.

Office E

As a Forty Plus organization, Office E is not typical of the other groups of unemployed professionals and executives bearing the Forty Plus name. Most members of Forty Plus organizations are well below the retirement age of 65 and, therefore, do not receive pensions from their former jobs. While the members of Office E are probably not much older as a group then the members of other Forty Plus clubs, the majority of them are receiving generous pensions as a result of their years in one of the military services (60% of the membership) or in the U.S. Civil Service (20% of the membership). Because their need for income is less urgent, their approach to finding new employment is somewhat more leisurely than at other Forty Plus organizations.

Apparently the success of the Forty Plus technique, that is, coaching the job seeker how to conduct his/her own effective job search, depends on level of motivation of the job seeker. An official of Office E told project researchers that he was concerned over the passivity of the members. They relied on passive job-seeking methods such as mailing out resumes and making telephone inquiries, rather than "hitting the streets."

The atmosphere at Office E was more like that of a social club than an office where men and women are working at looking for work. The organization is more of a refuge, a place to spend time with and meet others with similar backgrounds. It was apparent that for some members, the Forty Plus office offered an excuse to get out of the house and served as a cover for engaging in a planned job search. According to the Office E official, the most successful job seekers at Forty Plus are those who are "hungry."

Office F

Office F is more than a senior nonprofit employment office in the usual sense. In addition to finding nonsubsidized jobs for all kinds of older job seekers, Office F administers a Title IX program and a CETA Title I program for the disadvantaged elderly. In theory, each of the three employment programs or offices is distinct, but in practice, the office director juggles applicants, enrollees, subsidized job slots, and private sector listings in order to maintain a flexibility that permits quick and imaginative job placements.

The CETA program enrollees must be placed into unsubsidized employment within six months. When the office obtains a suitable listing from employers calling the "regular" employment service, a qualified CETA enrollee is encouraged to apply. The CETA slot may then be available to another needy older person. Similarly, directors of Title IX programs must attempt to place 10% of their enrollees into unsubsidized jobs.

The director of Office F claims that she greatly exceeded this rate by transferring enrollees to outside jobs obtained through the usual employer listings. On the one hand, the constant "rolling over" of CETA and Title IX job slots gives more disadvantaged older people the opportunity to participate; on the other hand, rapid job switches could be unsettling to the older person. CETA Title I, in particular, is intended to be a work experience program in which the participants develop job skills and good work habits. This process takes time.

Besides the employment services just described, Office F offers older workers opportunities to exercise their creative abilities in return for pay. Behind the office is a workshop where older craftsmen provide a reupholstering and recaning service. Across the street is a consignment shop that sells handcrafted gifts made by older people. At the time of the project researcher's visit to the office, the director was investigating the feasibility of opening a "drop your tot" center, a temporary babysitting service staffed by older persons.

Office G

To meet the needs of a special group of mature job seekers (and those people who need work but do not know how to look for a job) a center for displaced homemakers was established by the health and welfare agency of a western state.

Office G is mandated, by state law to provide job counseling, job creation, and job placement for displaced homemakers who have spent most of their adult years at home and now, because of widowhood, divorce, or other emotional and economic change, are forced into the job market. Most displaced homemakers, because of their lack of paid work experience, cannot find employment. They are often found ineligible for unemployment compensation and are frequently too young to receive Social Security benefits. Often from middle class backgrounds, displaced homemakers can also be declared ineligible for welfare and government employment programs for the disadvantaged.

The goals of the center naturally include helping individuals to become self-sufficient. Of equal importance, however, is the center's role as a model for other organizations. The center aims to demonstrate that (1) job training can be accomplished quickly, (2) homemaking consists of many valuable skills that can be applied to jobs outside the home, and (3) new jobs can be created that use the existing skills of homemakers and that serve community needs.

The director of the center has yet another goal, an unusual one for a program administrator. She is planning the dismantling of her program. She believes that once the displaced homemaker center has shown how displaced homemakers can be helped, other existing government agencies should take over responsibility that was theirs in the first place.

Two kinds of programs are offered to women coming to the center for assistance. The more intensive of the two is the intern program during which a woman is associated with the center for up to six months and is given the opportunity to develop job skills. Part of the training involves helping other women who come to the center with their adjustment programs. The second kind of service offered by the center is a series of workshops, and training and discussion groups on topics related to self-sufficiency and employment. Typical workshop subjects include "Job Readiness and Job Hunting," "Assertiveness Training," "Marital Dissolution," and "Health Care for the Woman in her Middle Years."

Chapter 5

Augmenting State Employment Security Agency Services to Older Job Seekers

The preceding chapter described nonprofit employment offices created to serve older job seekers. This chapter deals with another method of providing help to older people looking for jobs: to the regular SESA staff the addition of a staff of volunteers and/or individuals paid from Title IX or CETA funds and trained to work with and assist only the older applicants.

The need for the SESA to augment services to older workers is not obvious since all offices of the State Employment Service are charged with serving the public, old and young. Furthermore, some offices, have a staff member assigned to act as an "older worker specialist."

Employment Service statistics show, however, that SES offices are less likely to place older applicants than younger applicants. Indeed, placement of older workers has declined sharply in the last decade, a period during which the older worker specialist program has been de-emphasized.[1] Employment Service statistics in most states show that the placement of applicants 45 and older is several percentage points lower than the placement of all applicants. The placement rate decreases as the age of applicants increases. For example, for one western state, the statistics on placements for 1977 were as follows:

• All applicants	24% placed.
• Applicants 45 to 54	18% placed.
• Applicants 55 to 64	13% placed.
• Applicants 65 or older	10% placed.

In the 1960s, when the older worker specialist program was operating at its peak, applicants over 45 received some 18 to 20 percent of the placements made by the Employment Service. Currently, individuals in this age group account for only some 10 to 12 percent of the placements. (Odell, 1976)

In explaining the lower placement rate of older applicants, older worker employment supervisors at state or regional offices stated that these job seekers are more difficult to place; they take more time and effort. Moreover, in the evaluation of performance and in the determination of funding for the office, the number of placements is emphasized. Thus, the Employment Service staff tends to give more attention to the easier-to-place individuals.

---

[1] Odell, C.E. "Some Historical Notes on the Development of the U.S. Employment Service Older Worker Program," in Proceedings of the Training Institute of the Clearinghouse for Voluntary Employment Agencies for the Aging, Human Resources Center, 1976.

Factors mentioned as to why older applicants are harder to place include:

- Employer retirement plans.
- Social Security earning limitations.
- Lack of training programs for older workers.
- Limitations of the kinds of work older people can do.
- Inability of older persons to travel to jobs.

Project researchers, in discussions with older worker employment supervisors in several states and regions, found that most of the states visited give little emphasis and attention to older worker specialists. (See Chapter 2 for a description of research methods.) Some states appoint a staff member for each local SES office to be the older worker specialist, but except for rare cases he/she has a number of other assignments as well. Usually the "specialist" has received no training in the placement of older applicants. Typically, too, the state supervisor of older worker specialists for the SES has many other assignments, and this individual seldom exercises any functional supervision over local office older worker specialists to monitor, evaluate, and train them. Few states are using the training package on older workers produced for the Department of Labor by the University of Minnesota Rehabilitation Center.

In this chapter, two approaches for providing more help by the State Employment Service to older applicants are described: the Senior Workers Service and Project RENEW. The Senior Workers Service is housed in the local office of the State Employment Service of Spokane, Washington, and is staffed by unpaid volunteers under the supervision of a paid coordinator. Project RENEW is a five-state demonstration project funded by the Department of Labor, in which older persons serve as older worker specialists in local offices of the State Employment Service.

THE SPOKANE SENIOR WORKERS SERVICE

The Senior Workers Service (SWS) of Spokane, Washington, is a volunteer program organized seven years ago by the Greater Spokane Council on Aging. A successful program of its kind, SWS made some 1,500 placements in 1976, primarily of people over 55, in short-term, part-time, low-wage jobs, usually in the service area.

The State Employment Service in Spokane provides phone, desk, and office supplies for SWS. Some 50 volunteers, mostly from the local American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), and a supervisor, paid under CETA funds, staff the program. Four of the volunteers are retired SES employees.

The Senior Workers Service is sponsored by AARP, the Greater Spokane Council on Aging, and the Washington State Department of Employment Security. It is publicized by public service announcements on local radio and television stations and by cards distributed by the Social Security Office to each new Social Security applicant.

(GROW of Binghamton, New York, is another volunteer employment service housed within the State Employment Service. It is described in Appendix B, in the report on the New York State Workshop.)

Lillian Hodin, an employee of SWS, has written a brief article entitled "How to Set Up an Employment Service for Senior Workers at No Cost to Employer or Applicant and With No Budget for Administration." The article describes what is involved in establishing a volunteer senior employment service within a State Employment Office. The complete article follows:

How To Set Up An Employment Service For Senior Workers At No Cost To Employer Or Applicant And With No Budget For Administration

1. Start with any group of senior citizens, either in a club, senior center, a Council on Aging, or part of a program at an agency, etc.

2. Within this group get a few, even only one person who has faith, enthusiasm, initiative, and persistence -- call it a Committee on Employment and/or Chairman of Employment, or any title that sounds good.

3. Go to the nearest State Employment Office and request from the manager 1) desk space with a telephone and office supplies, franking mailing privilege, minor clerical services when needed, 2) one person designated as Older Worker Specialist to work closely with your group to help set up, maintain and advise this Senior Workers Service, and 3) occasionally a placement supervisor or interviewer to conduct training classes for volunteers. You may not get all three and can operate with less, but it would help immeasurably to have S.E.S. furnish all three.

4. With approval for this you now have the office and all contingent services. Your next step is to get volunteers to service this desk. In the beginning ask your committee, entire group, friends, relations, neighbors, any one to pinch-hit until you get really going. You will use Employment Service application forms, job orders, etc. and work closely with their regular placement department so that they can refer senior citizens to you for part-time, temporary, and seasonal work and you can refer ... people (to them) who are younger than senior age or who need full-time employment to support them. Primarily your service will be helping those who are retired or have some pension or income and want to supplement or keep busy, but not full-time, permanent jobs. Most retired people do not want full-time employment and also are concerned with earning too much so that Social Security payments are affected.

5. Open your office for business with your small group - only one is needed at the desk at a time, so divide the time into units. Try 9-12 and 1-4. This avoids rush hours and lunch out and gives only a three-hour stretch of work, which is not tiring. Perhaps you can only be open half a day and perhaps not every day in the beginning.

6. Ask for time on the agenda at meetings of all other senior groups (AARP, NARFE, NRTA, Council on Aging, Telephone Pioneers, other Senior Centers, etc.) until you get one group interested and cooperative to the point where their members will try to keep you supplied with volunteers. Then

your initial group can gradually step out if they wish. But, we continually call on the community for more volunteers, if we need them.

7. Now that you are actually started, ask radio, TV, and newspapers to give you coverage, community service time, etc. so that you can tell the public about it. Have mimeo circulars or flyers put up on bulletin boards at super markets, apartment houses, retirement homes, residential hotels, mail to ministers, churches, clubs, doctors, and have the Social Security Office post this and distribute a circular to each applicant coming in. Contact the Chamber of Commerce to get it on their printed list of community activities. Contact all men's business clubs and have one of your men speak a few minutes to publicize your employment service, to get jobs, applicants, and volunteers. Contact the women's clubs for the same purpose.

8. Retiring Employment Service people are of enormous help, if you can get them. Follow all retirement information in the paper to recruit new volunteers.

9. Set up a very simple procedure for taking applications and filing - we can use E.S. forms, but do not need to fill them out completely.

10. Have training meetings, workshops, or seminars fairly often - whenever you get together enough new volunteers - but, always invite trained people, too, for refresher training, to help new people, and to get acquainted.

    In the meantime, have them observe a volunteer who has been doing the job and then work with a trained volunteer the first few times before they are on their own.

11. From your volunteers, assemble a board of directors. Essentially, you need a -- Schedule Chairman
    Publicity "
    Desk & File "
    Employer Contacts "

12. As you grow, increase your board - this is one of the rewards for volunteers. Every circular and publicity should mention board members and volunteers' names. Rewards and recognition for work are essential to keep volunteers - also, the reward of getting someone a job, sometimes getting themselves a job (they have first crack at it.)

    Awards for 50 hours of service, 100, 150, etc. with certificates and appropriate dignitary giving the awards, luncheons as social get-togethers and business meetings combined, their names in the paper, their appearance on TV or radio (in one instance, a romance and subsequent marriage!) are all rewards and satisfactions derived from the work. These will help you keep your volunteers, and your service will grow.

13. Items of small expense can be met by the agency which volunteers to sponsor the group as a community project. The only ones you may have are 1) visiting cards so that representatives calling on employers, etc. can leave their card, 2) want ads in papers. You may be lucky and get these donated.

14. No matter how slow the traffic is at times, don't get discouraged. Regular employment in the community swings according to weather, labor market, vacation schedules, etc., and your little service will, too.

15. There are many other aids, such as:
    Training packets for volunteers
    Workshops for training volunteers
    RSVP Program to compensate for out-of-pocket money for senior volunteers
    Community task forces on Employment for the Elderly
    Governor's Committee to Employ the Handicapped
    Volunteer Bureau
    National Center for Voluntary Action
    Senior Center Directors
    Retirement Homes Personnel
    The "Occupations in Demand" and "Thumb-Nail Sketches of Applicants Available," put our regularly by the local Department of Employment Security

16. Keep statistical records. Everyone wants to know how many applicants are registered, how many jobs come in, how many jobs are filled by your own applicants, how many referrals to one job, how many cancellations, etc. Every time you hit some kind of high mark it is news and can get publicity. Celebrate one year of existence, the hundred mark of applications or jobs, and so on. These are materialistic marks of progress and people are impressed with the numbers. It is also a tangible sign of progress and achievement that volunteers can appreciate.

17. As long as the service places older people, you are performing a service that no one else is doing. If your community can and does provide an office where a senior is welcomed and all jobs offered to him are seeking older people so that age is not his barrier, then perhaps you do not need this kind of service. But, so far, senior workers are not getting this service in most communities.

Comments

Since Ms. Hodin wrote this article, a coordinator paid from CETA funds has been added to the Senior Workers Service. It obviously is not feasible to attempt to set up an employment service, making 1,500 placements a year, with no budget for administration.

Better than just any senior organization, the Council on Aging provides the best starting point for a "senior workers service," because the Council should be able to provide broad community support, as well as connections to other organizations.

Ms. Hodin's third point, getting space and support from the State Employment Service, would seem to be the most difficult. The older worker supervisor for Washington State indicated that the State Employment Security Agency has encouraged office managers to provide support for volunteers to work within the SES offices. However, many managers did not seem to be responsive, and they presented several arguments against working with volunteers:

- Volunteers take more staff time than they are worth.
- They don't know anything about our business; we have to train them and then they claim credit for it all.
- How do we account for what they do? It hurts our budget and workload statistics.
- If we let them do it, how are we ever going to get adequate funds and staff to do it ourselves?
- We should not be sharing our confidential records and information with these untrained, unprofessional people.
- They're only interested in finding a job for themselves, not really in helping others.

To get local SES office support it may be helpful to consult the state older worker supervisor. These individuals do not have authority over the office manager or the local office older worker specialist, but they do have functional supervision over services to older workers. They could provide some helpful suggestions on approaching various Employment Service managers. Also, for the local SES office manager to give support to volunteers to assist older workers, the objections listed in the previous paragraph would have to be answered and benefits to the Employment Service pointed out.

Project RENEW

Another approach to augmenting assistance to the older applicant from the State Employment Service is Project RENEW. Older people were hired with Senior Community Service Employment funds, and after training they served in local SES offices as older worker specialists.

The forerunner of Project RENEW was a program developed in Iowa to supplement the Employment Service staff to provide more assistance to older applicants.

Through the joint efforts of the Iowa Commission on Aging, the Iowa Departmentof Job Service, and the National Retired Teachers Association/American Association of Retired Persons (NRTA/AARP), the Retired Iowan Community Employment Program (RICEP), was developed. Older persons are hired on a half-time basis to work in Employment Service offices side-by-side with the regular SES staff. Their efforts are devoted solely to the placement of older job seekers. The job slots were originally provided by the NRTA/AARP as part of their Senior Community Service Employment Program (funded through Title IX of the Older Americans Act). Currently, however, RICEP is funded almost entirely by state appropriations.

The RICEP program was an immediate success, so much so, in fact, that two persons who had worked on the development of the original concept (now employees of the Preretirement Planning Center) convinced the Department of Labor to fund a pilot project to test the feasibility of instituting a RICEP-like program on a national basis. The pilot program, RENEW (Referral/Employment Network for Elderly Workers) was conducted from October, 1976, through July, 1977, in five states: Ohio, Michigan, Florida, Georgia, and Texas.

RENEW was virtually identical to its model, RICEP. In each participating state, 15 low-income older workers were hired, trained, and placed in Employment Service local offices as older worker specialists. The older worker specialist positions were provided by the NRTA/AARP through their Senior Community Service Employment Program. As with RICEP, the State Employment Service staff supervised the older worker specialists and provided a portion of their training. The considerable task of implementing the program in five states and providing guidance and coordination during the pilot phase was managed by the Preretirement Planning Center with funds provided by the Department of Labor.

The primary goal of Project RENEW was "to encourage and promote the meaningful employment of workers 40 years old and older, with special emphasis on those 55 and above." This goal was broken down into six objectives:

1. To assist in the employment of older persons in the five pilot states.

2. To provide the vehicle for added income for older persons.

3. To develop in employers a positive attitude toward employing older persons.

4. To enhance in older persons the feelings of self-worth and accomplishment.

5. To provide improved service to the aged by promoting the joint working of diverse state and national organizations.

6. To assist the Employment Service in its attainment of older worker placement objectives.

The role of the RENEW older worker specialists is central to the accomplishment of these objectives. The principal duty of the RENEW older worker specialist is to try to place older workers in jobs suited to their capabilities and experience. As well, their job description lists many supporting activities. Included in the additional duties of the RENEW worker are (1) developing jobs to open up opportunities for older workers, (2) preparing information on the program to be used in public information efforts, (3) maintaining files and preparing monthly activities summaries, (4) advertising RENEW by speaking at public engagements, and (5) following up on older workers after placement.

The task of recruiting the RENEW older worker specialists was logically assigned to the individual local State Employment Service offices where they were to be stationed. The NRTA/AARP assisted in the recruitment effort by providing guidance on eligibility criteria under Title IX regulations, and by linking SCSEP project directors with the State Employment Service locations where older worker specialists were to be assigned.

To be eligible for consideration as an older worker specialist, an applicant had to be at least 55 years of age and have an income below the poverty guidelines established for Senior Community Service Employment Programs ($2,970 plus approximately $960 per dependent). Also, it was hoped that the recruitment effort could turn up applicants with some background in personnel work or related fields.

Statistics compiled after all RENEW workers had been hired show that the typical older worker specialist was a white female about 62 years of age who was living alone. Most had a background in sales, office work, or teaching. The educational level of RENEW workers was surprisingly high, the mean being one year of college.

The turnover rate for RENEW older worker specialists for the duration of the pilot study was 18 percent (16 out of 88). Only six RENEW workers left for negative reasons: four were dissatisfied and two were relieved for poor performance.

To ensure the realization of the objectives established for Project RENEW, the Preretirement Planning Center took special care in designing and conducting the training program for RENEW older worker specialists. The introductory training program consisted of four to five days of intensive instruction. One centralized training session was conducted in each state. The centralized training design was considered to be an important feature of the program primarily in that it established an independent identity for RENEW and created a sense of unity among the older worker specialists. Also, centralized training ensured that all older worker specialists in each state received the same training. The training covered (1) Employment Service procedures and requirements, (2) special programs offered by each State Office on Aging, (3) the Senior Community Service Employment Program of the NRTA/AARP, and (4) the history, purpose, and objectives of Project RENEW. (One of the participating states asked that training be conducted locally because of the expense and the loss of on-the-job time for traveling to a centralized location. This arrangement was reluctantly agreed to by the Preretirement Planning Center. However, disappointing results on the part of the older worker specialists in this state clearly demonstrated the inadequacy of local training, so a centralized session was eventually held.)

Training was also provided on the job by the individual offices of the State Employment Service where RENEW older worker specialists were stationed. This rounded out the instruction in SES procedures and familiarized the older worker specialists with local office routine.

The formal training was completed by a three-day, centralized follow-up session conducted in each state. This session provided the RENEW older worker specialists with a review of the introductory training, gave them new training in other areas of their job description, and provided them an opportunity to discuss experiences and problems, and to suggest possible modifications to the program.

Because the success of the program would undoubtedly depend largely on publicity, a fairly extensive public information effort was mounted in each community where RENEW older worker specialists were stationed. Virtually all media were used in this effort. Press releases were distributed throughout the duration of the pilot phase. In addition, the local media in participating communities generated a considerable amount of publicity for the program by reporting on its operation and interviewing RENEW older worker specialists. The RENEW workers were encouraged to advertise the program by arranging public speaking engagements with public and private organizations concerned with senior citizens.

By the completion of the pilot phase in July, RENEW has accumulated some fairly impressive statistics. During the six months that the 75 RENEW older worker specialists had been on the job, they accounted for 5,839 referrals and 1,152 placements. More important, the statistics show a decided increase in placements each month (from 33 in January to 395 in June), indicating that the learning curve for the older worker specialists had probably not peaked by the end of the pilot phase. Future statistics should be even more impressive.

The implementation of the RENEW pilot project was not without problems, though. Oddly enough, recruiting older worker specialists presented the most significant problem. As stated earlier, it was considered desirable to recruit applicants with some experience in personnel work. At the very least, applicants were to "be interested in clerical/office type work" and to "be able to communicate with the public." But as it turned out, many with the desired background had an income greater than that allowed by SCSEP guidelines and were therefore not qualified for the RENEW position. Conversely, many applicants who qualified in the income guidelines did not possess the skills needed to perform effectively on the job.

The low salary being offered posed other problems for recruiters. Many applicants, especially those living in rural areas, would have had difficulty meeting transportation costs out of the minimum wage salary being offered. This problem was more prevalent in the states with large rural populations.

Occasionally there were problems related to the misuse of RENEW workers. As might be anticipated with this type of arrangement, there was a tendency for some local office managers to pre-empt the services of the RENEW older worker specialists for other pressing assignments. Such use of RENEW workers runs counter to the purpose of the program and was an item of concern for the RENEW coordinators. These practices were kept to a minimum through careful program monitoring.

Some problems encountered during the implementation of RENEW were related to bureaucratic resistance. Although involvement in the pilot project was freely agreed to by the Employment Service director in each participating state, enthusiasm for the program was not always shared by key bureaucrats involved in setting it up. Some State Employment Service officials claimed that training and supervision of the RENEW older worker specialists required too much staff time, and that the placements they made would most likely have been made by the regular staff anyway.

The RENEW pilot program was closely monitored to prevent and correct problems, and to provide technical assistance to the host agencies. Each participating state received at least three site visits from Preretirement Planning Center staff members. These visits involved meetings with representatives of participating agencies, and at least one visit to a local Employment Service office where a RENEW older worker specialist was stationed. Also, the program was followed carefully by a review of activity reports submitted monthly by RENEW workers.

On the whole, the RENEW pilot project would have to be termed a success. It certainly deserves an extended tryout. In fact, the Department of Labor has re-funded RENEW through July, 1978, with the stipulation that the Preretirement Planning Center discontinue its coordination activities in three of the original states (Michigan, Ohio, and Texas) and add two new states (Arkansas and Illinois) to the program. Three states were eliminated from the project to see how well they could manage the program without outside assistance.

DISCUSSION

Both Project RENEW and the Senior Workers Service have the goal of increasing the help given to older job seekers at State Employment Service offices. There are a number of differences in the two programs, which have implications for their methods of operation and the service they give to older job seekers. Some of these differences follow:

- SWS was organized in the local community; RENEW was organized at the state level.
- SWS serves older people seeking post-retirement jobs; RENEW serves all older applicants, especially those wanting full-time work.
- SWS develops its own listing of part-time and temporary jobs; RENEW uses the Employment Service job bank.
- Though located in a State Employment Service office, the SWS is largely autonomous of SES office procedures. The SWS is really a senior nonprofit employment office with a desk at the SES office; RENEW is an integral part of SES.
- Several weeks of training are essential for the RENEW older worker specialist. Moreover, SES administrators feel that several months of experience are necessary before the RENEW worker can function effectively; the SWS volunteers can learn the necessary procedures in an hour or so.
- SWS gives a number of individuals the opportunity to serve as volunteers and, in doing so, to learn about the State Employment Service and the job market for older workers.

It can be concluded that while SWS and RENEW share a common goal, the two programs serve largely different segments of the older job seekers, and one program cannot take the place of the other.

With increasing number of older persons seeking employment in an ever tightening job market, both the RENEW project and volunteer efforts like Senior Workers Service fill a vital and growing need. Perhaps in the not-too-distant future RENEW, or a hybrid version of the RENEW concept, can be implemented in all State Employment Service offices in major population centers. Such a move would go a long way toward filling the void created when the Older Worker Units were discontinued.

Chapter 6

The Role of Regional and State Offices on Aging in Employment Programs for Older Workers

The role of regional and state offices on aging in employment programs for older workers is considered in this chapter. In addition, examples of outstanding employment activities by state offices on aging are described.

Information presented in the chapter was obtained through discussions with the staff of some state and regional offices on aging and by studying state plans on aging and other documents.

EMPLOYMENT ROLE OF THE REGIONAL OFFICES ON AGING

Personal discussions were held with officials from regional offices on aging (ROA) in six regions, and telephone conversations were conducted with representatives of the other four regions. From these contacts, we can describe the ways in which regional offices on aging become involved in matters pertaining to the employment of older persons.

The ROA has no assigned responsibility concerning employment programs within the region. The office is not required to monitor employment assistance or needs or to help with employment program development. It does not control any funds for employment programs. Nevertheless, some ROAs are currently devoting significant amounts of staff time to employment.

Title IX

The factor that has brought the attention of ROAs to employment is the assignment of some $15 million of the $90 million Title IX appropriation (Senior Community Service Employment Program) to governors of states for Fiscal 1977. A governor could request that the funds be administered by the State Office on Aging or some other state agency. Alternatively, the governor could allow the funds to be administered by one of the Title IX national contractors. In nine states governors did opt for assignment of the state Title IX funds to national contractors rather than a state agency.

In some regions, the ROA was active in urging the state office on aging (SOA) to seek the control of the Title IX funds, while in other regions, the ROAs left the matter entirely up to the individual SOA. The number of state offices on aging within the region now administering Title IX funds varies considerably. In five regions, all or most SOAs are in charge of the funds while in three regions, one or none of the SOAs administers these funds. (In the remaining two regions, half of the SOAs control the funds.) We suspect that, in part, the number of SOAs in the regions with Title IX funds reflects the extent of interest in employment by the ROAs.

With the allocation of the Title IX funds to SOAs in certain states, some of the regional directors have become concerned with the use of these funds. As a result, they have assigned a staff member the part-time responsibility of monitoring developments in employment programs. In the regional office with greatest interest in employment, half time of one person is devoted to employment -- Title IX and other employment programs affecting older persons.

At the other extreme, one regional director did not know which of the state offices on aging in the region were administering Title IX funds. A regional director characterized his office's involvement in Title IX programs as follows: "The regional office may prod and offer suggestions, but in the final analysis the use of the funds is entirely up to the state administrators. State governments tend to jealously guard their prerogatives, and regional interference is not graciously accepted."

CETA

The ROA may be asked [illegible] review plans of Comprehensive Employment and Training Act prime sponsors. One director indicated that even though his staff's comments were solicited on CETA plans, there has never been any response to any of their comments.

Interagency Planning

Some regional directors of offices on aging have served on regional interagency planning groups concerned with aging. These groups exist in some regions and involve representatives from several agencies. In one region this interagency planning group has been concerned with employment of older people. The council was given the task of planning a program that would involve the training of older people to winterize houses and to work in crisis centers.

The several agencies involved (AOA, Labor, ACTION, HUD, Interior, etc.) could not agree on the goals. The Department of Labor participant in these discussions felt that little real planning had been accomplished in the meetings of the council. He postulated that one cause of the lack of progress could be that agencies were undergoing reorganization following the change of the presidential administration and were reluctant to take action. Furthermore, each agency spent a great deal of time pointing out the reasons why that agency could not take action. The planning group has redefined the goal to call for training of agency staff (e.g., State Employment Service, State Office on Aging) concerning employment of older people. However, a year after the establishment of the council, little progress has been made to plan the training.

Interaction with Regional Department of Labor Office

We assumed, prior to discussions with regional directors that concern with manpower programs affecting older people would naturally bring the ROA into interaction with the Regional Office of the Department of Labor. However, we learned that the ROA has less reason to interact with the Department of Labor Regional Office than we had believed. A group at the DHEW Regional Office provides information on CETA programs within the region, and information concerning Title IX programs is obtained from the Department of Labor National Office.

"The people at the Department of Labor Regional Office simply do not have the information on the Title IX programs," one ROA director stated.

It appeared that the ROA contact with the Regional Department of Labor occurs primarily by way of regional advisory boards.

A ROA director told of an incident pointing out the wide communications gap between his office and the Department of Labor Regional Office. In cooperation with the Department of Labor, the National Council on Aging arranged a training session on older workers for prime sponsors in the region. The ROA director heard of the scheduled training by accident and called the older worker specialist in the Department of Labor Regional Office for information. He offered to publicize the training with the offices on aging in the region.

Summary

Some ROAs have become involved with employment following the allocation of Title IX funds to some of the state offices on aging in Fiscal 1977. The role of these ROAs is to monitor these employment programs and to advise the SOAs, but the ROA does not have any control over use of the Title IX funds. The ROAs interaction with the Regional Office of the Department of Labor has been mostly through regional councils.

Interagency planning groups existing in some regions offer an opportunity for the Office on Aging to join with Department of Labor and other agencies to develop solutions to problems facing older persons. The activities of one regional interagency planning council concerned with employment of older people have been unproductive so far.

EMPLOYMENT ROLE OF THE STATE OFFICE ON AGING

Discussions with staff of state offices on aging showed a wide range of involvement with employment matters. In some states we found the State Office on Aging (SOA) staff largely uninformed and unconcerned with manpower programs affecting older workers within the state. On the other hand, in one state a SOA staff member has been giving full time to employment matters. The individual has gained an influential position in overseeing employment efforts concerning older people within the state: Project RENEW, the Title IX national contractors, CETA, and the distribution and use of the state Title IX money. In many states we visited, employment matters were a part-time assignment for one SOA staff member.

Manpower Activities Engaged in by State Offices on Aging

We found that SOAs can be involved in employment of older workers in a number of ways:

- Developing collaborative arrangements with manpower programs.
- Monitoring programs affecting older workers.

- Developing programs to serve older workers.
- Providing organized training concerning older worker employment and needs.
- Administering funds for older worker employment programs.
- Coordinating manpower services for older workers.
- Assessing problems and needs of older workers.
- Educating the public concerning older worker employment.
- Advocating in behalf of older workers to influence legislation or funding.

In discussions with SOA staff we found that no office was devoting significant effort to all these activities and that some offices were involved in none of them.

The annual state plans on aging provide a picture of the intentions of various states to engage in activities related to employment of older people.

The plans of 25 states regarding employment have been summarized in Table 6.1 below. For this summary, at least two states were selected from each of the 10 Federal regions. Nine of the 25 SOAs have no plans for employment. (Five of these SOAs do not control Title IX monies.) The plans of 16 SOAs concerned with employment commonly outline activities related to the management of Senior Community Service Employment Projects. The activities include developing interagency agreements, administering funds, providing technical assistance to area agencies on aging, and monitoring area agency activities regarding employment. Some SOAs plan to promote employment of older people in ways unrelated to management of Title IX funds, such as advocating in behalf of older workers to influence legislation (6 states), acting to improve existing employment services to older people (9 states), and providing added employment for older people within the office of aging network (4 states). Among other noteworthy employment activities proposed by individual SOAs some are creating the position of job developer and employment counselor within area agencies on aging, establishing a resource file of older people to be used as trainers or consultants, and conducting data collection and policy analysis related to mandatory retirement and age discrimination.

From the discussions with officials of the SOAs, it was apparent that the role of the State Office on Aging in regard to employment is undergoing change. In some states the administration of Title IX funds by the State Office on Aging led to a greatly increased involvement with manpower affairs. For example, in Washington State, a full-time employment specialist was appointed to the SOA staff to administer funds from Title IX. The employment specialist also has the responsibility of developing agreements with various manpower programs within the state and giving technical assistance on employment to area agencies on aging. In other states, the SOAs merely passed the Title IX funds along to area agencies or other organizations, with little involvement by the SOA staff.

Table 5.1

Plans Regarding Employment of Older Workers Mentioned in State Office on Aging 1978 Annual Plans for 25 States

	Number of States
No specific planned actions regarding employment mentioned	9
Specific actions regarding employment mentioned in state office of aging plan	16
Develop interagency working agreements (e.g., with CETA, SESA, Title IX Contractors)	12
Administer Title IX funds	9
Provide technical assistance to area agencies regarding employment	6
Advocate in behalf of older workers to influence legislation and policy	6
Monitor area agency activities related to employment	5
Provide training on older worker capabilities and needs	4
Increase employment of older people by state or area agencies on aging	4
Serve as a member of a planning council concerned with older workers	3
Attempt to influence distribution within the state of Title IX jobs under national Title IX contractors	3
Attempt to obtain a higher proportion of CETA jobs for older applicants	2
Plan other improvement of employment services to older workers through existing resources	4
Summarize and report existing data on the situation of older workers	2
Other specific actions mentioned by individual states	10
Hold pre-retirement planning seminars in planning and service areas to deal with income maintenance, housing, health, and related issues of retirement.	
Seek funding to create position in the area agencies on aging to act as job developers and employment counselors for older persons.	
Develop a working agreement regarding displaced homemakers programs.	

Continued

Table 6.1 (Continued)

Assist in the coordination of Title IX by sponsoring a workshop on employment for the elderly involving representatives of the national contractors and local project directors.

Establish a resource file of older persons throughout the state who can be utilized as trainers/consultants.

Assist in the recruitment of 15 older persons for a senior environmental employment program to be implemented by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Maintain formal linkages with ACTION to increase efforts in behalf of volunteer and paid employment opportunities.

Develop and maintain an information system on employment for older workers. Coordinate this effort with the existing information systems of the SESA and CETA prime sponsors.

Work with other state agencies to further develop part-time employment in government.

Conduct data collection and policy analysis related to mandatory retirement and age discrimination.

---

*Taken from the FY 78 State Office of Aging plans for 25 states. The 25 states arranged within Federal regions are:

Region I	Maine, Connecticut, Massachusetts
Region II	New Jersey, New York
Region III	Pennsylvania, District of Columbia, Delaware
Region IV	Florida, Kentucky, Georgia
Region V	Ohio, Wisconsin, Illinois
Region VI	Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico
Region VII	Iowa, Missouri, Kansas
Region VIII	Utah, Colorado
Region IX	California, Arizona
Region X	Oregon, Washington, Idaho

Some states did become involved with employment prior to the appropriation of Title IX money to governors of states. For example, some area agencies on aging have received Title IX funds from the National Council on Aging to administer programs employment older people (e.g., New Jersey, New York). In some instances states have initiated and planned projects within the state affecting employment of older workers (e.g., Texas, Iowa).

Concerns Often Expressed by State Office on Aging Staff

In discussions with staff of the State Office on Aging, certain concerns regarding employment were commonly expressed.

Title IX jobs should not only be held by older Americans' they should also serve older Americans.

Older applicants receive relatively little service from the State Employment Service.

CETA programs tend to include few older persons. A variety of explanations were offered.

The SOA has the responsibility of insuring that all Title IX jobs within the state are located in areas according to need. Title IX national contractors, with the exception of Green Thumb, are often unresponsive to SOA suggestions regarding job location.

The major barriers to employment of older people is the Social Security earning limit and the limitation of transportation.

Coordination with other agencies, especially the State Employment Security Agency, is difficult.

One SOA director provided a typical instance of difficulties in coordination with SESA. They tried to discuss more CETA jobs for older workers with the State Employment Security Agency. Despite their interagency agreement, communication was "not good." The director believes that the State Employment Security Agency has a very low priority for the employment of older workers. She noted that a different member from the State Employment Service, often a junior staff member, attended the various meetings. In some states, however, the State Office on Aging was much more successful in cooperating with the State Employment Security Agency in behalf of the older workers. For an example, see the discussion below of the Retired Iowans Community Employment Program.

OUTSTANDING MANPOWER ACTIVITY BY STATE OFFICES ON AGING

Some state offices on aging are engaged in outstanding activities on behalf of older workers, we learned. Described below are the activities of five of these SOAs: the New York Workshop on employment of older workers; the California long-range plan on aging; the Virginia studies of economic needs of older persons and long-range plan on aging; the Washington State assessment of the needs of the elderly; and the Iowa model employment programs.

New York State Training Workshop on Employment of Older People

A conference on employment of older workers hosted by the State Office on Aging can provide the occasion to discuss and initiate several activities related to older workers:

- Assessing older worker needs.
- Monitoring employment programs.
- Developing collaborative relationships.
- Providing training.

A workshop on employment, held in March, 1977, by the New York Office on Aging engaged in several of these activities related to older worker employment. The conference was attended by the Project OLDER WORKER staff. An account of the conference sessions is given in Appendix B.

The conference brought together agencies within the state of New York that are concerned with employment and aging: (1) the area agencies on aging, (2) Title IX and Title X project sponsors, (3) the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act prime sponsors, (4) the age discrimination and employment agencies, and (5) the senior nonprofit employment offices.

The two-day conference had sessions dealing with goals, age discrimination, Title IX and Title X programs, legislation, job placement techniques, and CETA.

Employment of Older People and the Virginia Long-Range Plan for the Elderly

The Virginia Office on Aging's long-range plans for the elderly has economic status (including employment) as one of its areas of interest. The plan is being written by the staff of the Office on Aging with advice from the Governor's Advisory Board on Aging, the area agencies on aging and other state agencies. The result of the planning activity is a document published in 1976, titled Virginia's Direction in Aging. This publication is intended for public review and comment. The plan will be revised after a period of discussion and will be updated every two years.

According to the publication (page 3), "The plan's recommendations are not binding on any agency. For its part, the Office on Aging intends to work with State and local agencies in refining the plan, costing out recommendations, eliminating, revising, and adding, as appropriate, before developing a final plan. *It is the intention of the Office to seek general acceptance of the policies for serving older Virginians developed in the philosophy and goals of the plan and to pursue the successful implementation of the recommendations over the six-year period covered by the plan.* Shorter-range operational plans developed by the Office will reflect longer-range priorities and it is our hope that future efforts by other State agencies and by local agencies will recognize the directions set forth in this plan."

To obtain needed background information on economic needs and employment, the Office on Aging staff prepared two reports, Economic Programs for the Elderly and The Economic Status of Older Virginians.

The first report, Economic Programs for the Elderly, presents a description of programs concerned with (1) retirement income (e.g., Social Security); (2) income supplementation (e.g., food stamps); (3) employment (e.g., CETA, Foster Grandparents); and (4) placement (e.g., the State Employment Service). The Virginia Office on Aging surveyed national, state and local agencies with programs concerned with economic security to obtain a brief description of each program.

The second report, The Economic Status of Older Virginian's, is based primarily on published Census Bureau and Department of Labor data. In many cases, it was necessary to use national data and interpret this information for use by the Commonwealth of Virginia. The major findings of this report are quoted here:

- In Virginia, 30% of those 65+ are classified as poor by the Social Security Administration.
- The medium income for persons 65+ is approximately half of what it is for those under 65.
- Older workers have difficulty finding new jobs once they are unemployed.
- In Virginia, five-sixths of the older population (305,000 persons) rely on Social Security checks for a majority of their income.
- Social Security benefits are not adequate to meet the economic needs of older persons.
- The elderly are harder hit by the high cost of living than persons in other age groups.
- Most pension benefits are not sufficient to allow the elderly a "comfortable" existence.
- Income supplementation programs assist in providing some relief to the elderly, but do not substantially alter their economic status.
- Employment and job placement programs in Virginia seem to benefit relatively small numbers of older persons.

The recommendations for the Virginia long-range plan concerning employment of older people are listed in the document, Virginia's Direction in Aging. They are quoted below from pages 21, 22, and 27.

- Pre-retirement education programs including financial planning should be initiated for all State employees with technical assistance available at the State level to all employers (public and private) that wish to initiate pre-retirement programs.
- The Office on Aging should initiate an employer education program to acquaint employers with the job potential for older workers, recruiting procedures, employment options, and the provisions of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967.
- Each Prime Sponsor designated under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act shall develop procedures for obtaining regular input from older worker representatives and for reviewing annual allocations of resources to determine whether the needs of older workers are adequately addressed.

- Area Agencies on Aging should initiate cooperative efforts with the local Virginia Employment Commission Offices, Prime Sponsors, and other agencies serving older workers designed to insure greater employment for older persons wishing to work.

- Employment placement programs serving older persons should identify elderly women, particularly widows who wish to work, as a primary target group.

Employment and the California Long-Range Plan on Aging

The development of a long-range plan on aging was funded by the California legislature in 1976. The resulting initial plan described in the review draft of The California Long-Range Plan on Aging, published in 1977, is being widely circulated for comment. The plan was developed by the California Department of Aging under the leadership of the California Commission on Aging. Initial comments on the proposed recommendations were obtained in a series of public meetings.

One chapter of the plan is oriented to employment. First, the published facts bearing on needs of older workers are reviewed: (1) Social Security earning limitations, (2) involuntary retirement, (3) discouragement among older job seekers, (4) duration of unemployment, and (5) training needs.

The plan briefly and clearly sketches the realities of age discrimination in employment (see page 292): "Discrimination because of age continues to persist, although it is often subtle and difficult to identify. An estimated one out of every two available jobs is closed to persons over 55, and one out of every four is closed to persons over 45. Older applicants are often told that they are over-qualified; lack formal and/or recent schooling (although they have years of experience); or they may be required to pass a pre-employment physical exam (although physical requirements of the job are minimal) or an aptitude test geared for younger people. Older employees may be passed over for promotion or asked to take an early retirement. ... Some employers have a misconception about the older worker's ability, productivity, and flexibility. Older persons tend to be unfairly and inaccurately stereotyped as inefficient, prone to illness, slow, unreliable, and unproductive. There is also a reluctance on the part of some employers to invest in the on-the-job-training for the older worker who will be employed for only a few years before mandatory retirement. Further, some employers are reluctant to hire older workers because of the increased cost of fringe benefits such as pensions, group life, accident and health insurance."

The plan then describes the resources, public and private, within California for assisting the employment of older workers.

The goal of the California plan concerning employment is that "older Californians shall have opportunities for employment without discrimination based on age." In pursuing this goal several policies are stated with one or more short-range action recommendations for each. (This information is quoted from pages 309-315 of the review draft.)

> Policy 1: The state shall encourage the availability of a sufficient number of new jobs for older workers.

The plan lists the following short-range actions for this policy:

144

- The California Department of Aging shall provide technical assistance to local agencies in developing the Title IX Senior Community Service Employment Program.

- The CDA shall work with the Department of Health and the Department of Employment Development to create job opportunities for older persons in senior day health care centers.

- The Department of Health in coordination with the CDA should urge health care providers to train and employ older workers as homemaker/chore and home-help workers.

- The CDA shall seek resources to fund jobs for older persons trained as paralegals and community services advisors.

Policy 2: The state shall encourage the development of more flexible alternatives to traditional job structuring, in order to make existing jobs more available to older workers.

The short-range actions for this policy are:

- The CDA in coordination with the State Personnel Board shall identify and implement steps to restructure jobs within the CDA so that more jobs can be made available to older workers.

- Area Agencies on Aging, nutrition projects and other projects funded by the CDA shall identify the steps necessary to restructure jobs for older persons and shall develop plans to do so.

- The Employment Development Department shall urge employers to restructure jobs for older workers.

- Other public agencies should review existing work assignments to determine which could be better served by part-time utilization of retirement-age persons.

Policy 3: Older workers shall receive their fair share of public service jobs; and the state shall encourage private industry to provide older workers with a fair share of private sector jobs.

The short-range actions associated with this policy are:

- The State CETA Council and the Employment Development Department should develop procedures to ensure that older workers receive their fair share of jobs funded under CETA.

- The Employment Development Department should establish procedures to ensure that employment services at all levels are staffed by people who are specialized in job development and placement of older workers.

- Management in the public and private sector should be encouraged to examine job requirements, and personnel and training policies to ensure that standards are not geared solely to younger workers.

- The Employment Development Department, in cooperation with the CDA, and the California Commission on Aging should make available to employers findings of recent research regarding the performance of older workers.

- The CDA shall provide funds available under Title IV-A (of the Older Americans Act) to institutions and agencies to develop and sponsor job training programs for older workers.

Policy 4: Older persons shall be given preference for employment in programs designed to serve them.

The short-range action associated with this policy is:

- The CDA and projects funded by the CDA shall make provisions in their affirmative action plans to combat discrimination on the basis of age.

Employment Needs Described by the Survey of Older Residents of Washington State

In 1976, some 3,400 elderly residents of Washington State were interviewed concerning their need for services. The study was jointly managed by the Office on Aging and by the Office of Research, both in the Department of Social and Health Services. The survey was carried out by the Gilmore Research Group with a random sample of people who were age 60 or older.

The purposes of the survey were (1) to provide baseline data for the legislature, the Department of Social and Health Services, the area agencies on aging, and other state and local agencies, (2) to aid in planning, policy formation, and program development for the state's elderly, and (3) to provide information that would help evaluate the impact of the Senior Citizen Service Project.

The findings of the study have been presented in a report An Assessment of the Needs of the Elderly in Washington State: A Summary Report, Gilmore Research Group, February 1977. In addition, a computerized file of the survey data has been established, which will be used to respond to requests. Those needing information on services to the elderly are encouraged to submit their questions to the director of the Office on Aging. If the requested information is not available in the survey file, the Office on Aging will attempt to locate it.

In addition to employment, the survey deals with other areas: housing, transportation, social relations, health, diet, and expenses.

Work status data showed that 11% of Washington's elderly are working outside the home and about 2% are actively looking for work. Over half of the people looking for work say that no jobs are available.

Those who are retired appear well-adjusted. More than 75% say their retirement was voluntary, and half said that they "miss nothing" about working.

There is a significant group interested in working in a volunteer program if their expenses could be paid. A total of 23% are currently doing volunteer work or are interested in a volunteer program.

The survey respondents were questioned to determine to what extent various unmet needs constituted a problem for them. One in 20 said that employment was a problem as compared to one in four who said that money and income were a problem. It was found that 1% rated employment as their single most important problem, as compared to 20% who rated income and money as a single most important problem.

Awareness of and the use of various services were also examined in the survey. Half the respondents were aware of various employment services they could use. This can be compared to some 80% awareness of senior centers they could use. Only 1% of the elderly respondents actually use employment services, while 20% use senior centers. It was estimated from the survey that employment services would have a potential use among some 10% of the elderly population.

The Iowa Employment Projects for Older People

In Iowa, several outstanding employment programs have been developed for older workers, including the Retired Iowans Community Employment Program (RICEP) and projects employing older workers to conduct inventories of water systems and of pesticides. The projects are outstanding for several reasons: because of the interagency cooperation involved in establishing and planning them, and because of their accomplishments in training and employing older workers and demonstrating the capabilities of older workers. In addition, these projects have served as a model for national demonstration projects, such as Project RENEW, funded by the U.S. Department of Labor to operate in several states. (See the discussion of Project RENEW in a following chapter in this report.) The success of the environmental inventory projects led to a national demonstration project involving the Administration on Aging and the Environmental Protection Agency whereby in each Federal region an environmental project employing older workers is being carried out with the involvement of the State Office on Aging.

Retired Iowans Community Employment Program

The Retired Iowans Community Employment Program, established in 1975, is almost entirely funded by the Iowa legislature. It was developed by the Iowa State Office on Aging, the State Employment Security Agency, and NART/AARP which administers the program. Mr. Paul Bridges of the Pre-Retirement Planning Center was the source of the general conception of RICEP.

The program provides for older persons to be trained to work in State Employment Service local offices to assist older applicants in obtaining work. Currently, there are 22 RICEP older worker specialists working in local Employment Service offices throughout the State of Iowa. RICEP employees receive two weeks of training.

The results of the program have been impressive. For the last fiscal year (ending June 30, 1977) some 2,700 placements were made by RICEP workers.

Environmental Inventory Projects

Two environmental inventory projects employing older workers have been completed in Iowa: the pesticide survey and the water system survey.

The Iowa Commission on the Aging and the state offices of NART/AARP recruited and trained 72 older workers to locate and identify potentially dangerous pesticides and empty pesticide containers. These older workers were employed under the direction of the Department of Agriculture.

The major findings of the pesticide survey were that the majority of retail stores had, on hand, banned or obsolete pesticides. One farm out of five had empty pesticide containers. Many retailers and farmers were unsure of how to dispose of banned or obsolete pesticides or empty containers.

For an inventory of state public water systems, 23 elderly workers, hired on a half-time basis, were trained to locate and inventory new public water sources. Several new water sources were identified through this project.

Both of these projects provide much needed information for improvement of the environment, at the same time demonstrating the capabilities and productivity of older workers.

SUMMARY

Stimulated by increased funding of public service employment programs for older workers, the involvement of regional and state offices on aging with employment of older workers has been increasing.

From discussions with the staffs of state offices on aging in 10 states, the involvement of state offices on aging with employment was found to vary from little or none in some states to offices with a full-time staff member who has the job of monitoring employment programs, developing cooperative agreements with organizations concerned with manpower programs, and providing information and training on older worker needs and services.

Examples of outstanding State Office on Aging activities concerning employment of older people were presented: the Virginia and California long-range plans on aging, the Washington State survey of older persons to assess their needs for service, the New York State workshop on employment of the elderly, and the Iowa employment projects for older persons (training older people to serve as older worker specialists in State Employment Service local offices, using older persons to conduct surveys of pesticides and of water supplies).

Chapter 7

Discussion and Implications

The Older Americans Act affirms the right of older people to "an adequate income in retirement," "employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age," and "meaningful employment opportunites." In this report we have examined the degree to which these goals are being achieved and the role of the Office on Aging in relation to these goals. We have also looked at the functioning of voluntary nonprofit employment offices for older people and the part played by the State Employment Service offices in assisting older job seekers.

Evidence presented in this report is based partially on data on older job seekers, collected specifically for this study, and partially on data gathered in prior studies. We do present some new data on employment experiences and needs of job seekers 55 or older, on the functioning of voluntary nonprofit employment offices for older workers and on the employment activities of regional and State Offices on Aging.

In this chapter we summarize and discuss the problems and needs of older job seekers, the State Employment Office assistance to older job seekers, and the employment role of the State Office on Aging. The report concludes with recommendations based on the findings.

PROBLEMS AND NEEDS OF OLDER JOB SEEKERS

To the contrary of the popular image that older people want to retire to a world of leisure and year-round sunshine, a significant number wants to continue working. Many need at least part-time employment to assure an adequate income in retirement.

Our research (as well as other studies of older workers) has shown that many older job seekers experience severe difficulties. They tend to require a longer period of time to look for a job than do younger workers, especially those older workers who are looking for professional or administrative jobs. Many older job seekers become discouraged and give up actively looking for work. Because of the number of discouraged older job seekers, the unemployment rates considerably understate the extent of employment problems for this age group.

Despite the Age Discrimination Act of 1967, discrimination against older workers because of age continues to be widespread. This conclusion is based on the opinions of many employers, as well as on the results of studies on the differential treatment of older and younger job seekers. The staff of voluntary employment offices for older people reported in our survey that employers, especially large companies, were generally reluctant to hire older workers. We found this situation confirmed by most older job seekers; they feel they have been subjected to discrimination by employers because of their age. However, only a minority can cite explicit discriminatory acts on the part of employers. For most, age discrimination is experienced as a systematic exclusion from consideration for jobs without actual mention by an employer of the job applicant's age.

A minority of older job seekers responding to our survey reported the need for less physically demanding work than they previously had. However, the majority reported they did not feel that their ability to perform work was limited by health or disability. This confirms past research which shows that older workers generally perform as well as younger workers, as judged by overall job productivity, number of job-related accidents, work capacity and ability to learn.

Major Areas of Help Sought

A source of job leads is the help wanted most by older job seekers surveyed. Many wanted assistance in contacing employers, while a minority chose to handle all employer contacts themselves and marked their urgent need as "a list of job openings I can look over myself."

Many persons were also looking for understanding and personal attention--"someone I can talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers." A third need often mentioned was advice on how to deal with age discrimination.

Special Needs of Certain Categories of Respondents

Certain categories of respondents--women, long-term unemployed and middle aged job seekers--have special needs, as shown by the survey.

The majority of older female job seekers are single, separated, divorced, or widowed. They more often mention a need for job training, which reflects the difficulties some women experience in reentering the labor force as a full-time, paid worker after years of being a homemaker and/or a part-time worker.

Our research showed that this group requires other training in addition to job training, to reenter the job market as full-time employees. Many displaced homemakers need to gain confidence in their potential value as an employee. Training is especially needed to help them escape the stereotype of older working women, which tends to confine them to low-paying jobs.

The long-term unemployed (those out of work and searching for a job over six months) also have special problems. Many lack the confidence in themselves to find a job, and they feel they are victims of age discrimination.

The long-term unemployed tend to be looking for a professional, technical, or administrative job. This association of high educational level with longer periods of unemployment is the opposite of what is found in employment surveys of young job seekers. Our findings suggest that the difficulties of some of the long-term unemployed older people in getting work reflect the lack of openings for senior level managers and professionals, rather than a need for training and experience.

Job seekers in our sample aged 55 to 64 years reported more urgent and pressing employment problems than those 65 or older. They wanted more kinds of help from the employment office they visited and were more often dissatisfied with the help they received. They were most often looking for full-time work, and they were more likely to report that their family would have great difficulty in managing if they did not have work.

Recent Helpful Legislation

Recent legislation promises to alleviate some of the employment problems faced by older workers. The earning limit for Social Security payments has been raised, permitting retirees to obtain legally a supplementary income corresponding better to their financial needs.

In April, 1978, President Carter signed a bill outlawing mandatory retiremenet in most jobs, thus supporting the right to work for elderly people. Many older people have been denied this right; half of the respondents who had retired from a job said they wanted to continue working but had been forced to retire.

EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE TO OLDER JOB SEEKERS

During the last decade there have been major changes in programs to assist older job seekers.

- There has been a deemphasis on the use of older worker specialists at State Employment Service offices. Services to older applicants at public employment offices have declined sharply.
- Through a recent national demonstration project, older workers, paid through public service employment programs, have worked in local State Employment Service offices to provide special help to older applicants.
- Several nonprofit employment offices catering to older workers have been established throughout the country.
- The Senior Community Service Employment Program (Title IX) of the Older Americans Act has provided public service employment for low-income people who are 55 or older.
- The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973, through local prime sponsors, has furnished training and public service jobs to a number of older workers.

Assistance Through State Employment Service

The U.S. Department of Labor and the State Employment Security Agencies in the last decade have deemphasized assistance to the older worker. The DOL position of Assistant Secretary for Older Worker Programs was eliminated and the older worker units at local offices were abolished. Subsequently, there has been a sharp decline in the proportion of State Employment Service placements going to older applicants. Discussions with officials at State Employment Security Agencies and at DOL regional offices indicated that the current level of effort devoted to older workers is low in most states. Part-time older worker specialists have been appointed in some local offices, but little is being done to train them or to monitor or evaluate their work. The State Employment Service manual contains guidance concerning the counseling of older job applicants. However, it does not include a job description for an older worker specialist which indicates a lack of agreement on what an older worker specialist should do.

For State Employment offices the placement rate of older applicants is below that for applicants in general. Older worker supervisors of SESAs explain that lower rate by arguing that older workers are harder to place than their younger counterparts, and since State Employment Service offices are rewarded on the basis of the number of placements made, the staff obviously prefers to spend time assisting a younger worker.

The analysis by the National Council on Aging of statistics collected through the Employment Service Automated Recording System (ESARS) discloses that older workers are less likely to get services at a State Employment Service office than younger applicants. The older the applicant the less likely he is to get services. However, when he is referred to a job the older worker is just as likely to be hired as his younger counterpart, according to ESARS statistics.

Recently, assistance for older workers at some local State Employment Service offices has been increased by using older worker specialists paid under Title IX funds or CETA funds. A major effort of this kind is Project RENEW under which 75 low-income, unemployed older workers were hired with Title IX funds, trained, and placed in Employment Service local offices in five states to work solely with older applicants. The task of implementing the program and of providing guidance and coordination was managed by the Preretirement Planning Center of Des Moines, Iowa, under a Department of Labor grant.

The principal duty of the RENEW older worker specialist is to try to place older workers in jobs suited to their capabilities and experience. In addition, their job description lists many supporting activities: developing jobs, advertising RENEW by giving speeches, and releasing information, and following up on older workers after placement. RENEW workers in each state were given several days of intensive training at a central location as well as training on the job in the local office where the RENEW older worker specialists were stationed.

The achievements of Project RENEW has been impressive; consequently, the program is to be expanded to additional states. From our review of Project RENEW, we can forecast that difficulties, inherent in operating an expanded program, will likely render it much less effective than it has been during its pilot phase. The difficulties we foresee are:

- Increasing resistance by SESA officials to the program. Some Employment Office managers have objected to having a Project

RENEW worker in their office, citing space limitations and requirements of time to supervise.

- An inadequate pool of talent from which to select RENEW older worker specialists conforming to the limitations of Title IX. RENEW workers are typically highly educated and experienced in office and administrative work.

- Preempting the time of the RENEW older worker specialist for Employment Office assignments not related to older workers. This was a problem during the pilot program.

If the planning, training, and monitoring functions now carried out by the Preretirement Planning Center are turned over to the individual State Employment Security Agencies the success of RENEW will reflect the priority the respective states have assigned to serving older workers.

Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices for Seniors

In the last decade, a number of employment offices serving the needs of older job seekers have been established in the United States. There are now over 30 voluntary nonprofit employment offices nationwide assisting older people in finding jobs in the private sector or in government. The offices are "voluntary" because, unlike the State Employment Service, their existence is not required by law; they are "nonprofit" because no fee is charged for services.

Most nonprofit employment offices are located in large cities and suburbs and operate independently of each other. The number of these offices located within a state, however, is not proportionate to the number of elderly people in the state.

The senior nonprofit employment offices can be divided into two groups: the Forty Plus clubs and all other employment offices.

Forty Plus offices differ markedly from other senior employment offices in type of clients, source of funds, procedures, and services offered. Membership in the eight Forty Plus clubs in the U.S. is restricted to those who have been in professional or managerial jobs. Each Forty Plus club operates autonomously, but all share an approach to job hunting which places the emphasis on the applicant organizing his own job hunt, finding job leads, and "selling" himself to employers. Members pay dues, which go to rent office space, and they are expected to give a certain number of hours each week to help run the office and assist other members in their job hunt. Almost all members of Forty Plus clubs are white, middle-aged males with a college education.

The other nonprofit employment offices attract a variety of people, mostly those whose previous employment was not professional or managerial. Many of the applicants to these offices are people over 65 years of age who are looking for part-time jobs--most commonly, service, household, or clerical positions.

Most offices are small-scale operations, averaging one new applicant a day. (For the offices studied, the number of new applicants ranged from five to 400.) Their budgets have only a slight relationship to the number of people served by the office. Available funds can range from none at all to more than a million dollars a year. However, the average budget runs about $25,000 a year, with the most frequent source of funds being the Federal, state or local government. Most offices depend, at least in part, on unpaid volunteers to run the office.

The burden of job search and placement is borne by the employment office staff, not the applicant. Both employer and applicant are screened by the staff before any referrals are made. The services offered by these employment offices lead directly to job referral and placement--the services applicants to these offices say they most urgently need.

Senior nonprofit employment offices are not closely affiliated with the State Employment Service. Only a few referrals are made between the two offices, and exchange of job listings or other information is infrequent.

Applicants to senior nonprofit employment offices (excluding Forty Plus Clubs) feel that the offices meet some needs well, some inadequately. The offices are helpful in finding and contacting employers, providing help in deciding kinds of work to look for, and providing someone to talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers.

These offices are less than adequate in providing information or advice on job training, information on job opportunities in other towns, and advice on dealing with age discrimination.

Public Service Employment

Both the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP) and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) provide public service jobs for older workers--SCSEP for those 55 or older and CETA for workers regardless of age. These programs also may assist workers in obtaining unsubsidized jobs--CETA through training and SCSEP through a requirement to place at least 10 percent of those enrolled into unsubsidized employment. Some individuals under CETA or SCSEP programs work in employment offices assisting older people to obtain jobs.

Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)

The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act of 1973 established manpower programs to replace all Department of Labor categorical employment programs, except Job Corps and the Mainstream Older Workers Program. Title I of the act provides for job training; Title II and Title VI provide for public service employment.

CETA programs are planned and administered by some 450 prime sponsors--city or county governments or a consortium of several local governmental units. Each prime sponsor is required to create a manpower planning council whose members are representative of the community. Duties of the council are to plan and evaluate the employment programs of the prime sponsor. Within certain limits set by the Department of Labor, the council is free to determine which groups should be served in its area.

Older worker enrollment in CETA programs totals 77,000, more than are served by SCSEP, but still an underrepresentation. In FY 1977, only about 4 percent of those in CETA programs were 55 or older, even though this age group comprises 8 percent of the unemployed population. As would be expected, older workers participate more often in the public service job programs than in training. In FY 1977, individuals 55 or older comprised about 6 percent of participants in Titles II and VI, compared to 3 percent in Title I.

Last year, CETA regulations, which prohibit discrimination on the basis of age, were strengthened to help eliminate age bias. These regulations include the following requirements for prime sponsors:

- They may not cite SCSEP as a reason for minimizing services to older workers.
- They must provide statistics describing the unemployed population in their area and the segments they intend to serve.
- They must provide justification when their service plan to a group (based on age, sex or race) differs 15 percent or more from the incidence of that group in the unemployed population.

Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP)

The Senior Community Service Employment Program derived from Title IX of the Older Americans Act, succeeds the Department of Labor's Operation Mainstream Program for older workers. The stated goal of the program is "to foster and promote useful part-time opportunities in community service activities for unemployed low-income people who are 55 years old and who have poor employment prospects." "Community service," to be carried out in public or private nonprofit organizations, is defined by the law to include (1) social, health, welfare, and educational services; (2) legal and other counseling services and assistance, including tax counseling; (3) library, recreational and other similar services; (4) conservation, maintenance or restoration of natural resources; (5) community betterment or beautification; (6) antipollution and environmental quality efforts; and (7) economic development.

The financial status of participants in the program, which is administered by the Department of Labor, must fall below poverty levels. The program provides certain supportive services, such as annual physical examination, job-related counseling, and transportation. No limitation is set on the length of time an individual can hold an SCSEP job.

Eighty percent of Title IX funds is managed by five national contractors; the remaining 20 percent of the funds is allocated directly to the states on a formula basis. The states, in turn, may either select a state agency (such as the Office on Aging) to administer the funds, or recommend that the funds be managed by one or more of the national contractors.

Among the various states and territories of the U.S., 29 governors have designated their Office on Aging to administer the funds, 17 used the state manpower/employment structure, and 10 turned the money over to the national contractors.

Following is a chart showing the five national contractors, the number of SCSEP jobs they administer, and how they manage their own programs:

National Contractor	Number of Jobs Administered	Management of Programs
Green Thumb, National Farmers Union	13,000	Administered directly at state/local level.
National Council of Senior Citizens	7,000	Subcontracted to public and nonprofit organizations.
National Retired Teachers Assoc./American Assoc. of Retired Persons	5,125	Administered directly at state/local level.
National Council on Aging	3,220	Subcontracted to public and nonprofit organizations.
U.S. Forest Service	2,450	Work provided primarily in conservation projects for national forests.

The typical participant in all of the programs, except for those in the Forest Service program, is white, female, and widowed, over 65 years of age and without a high school diploma. About one-third are from minority groups. For the U.S. Forest Service, the majority of participants are men, with about 14 percent coming from minority groups.

In addition to providing useful community service employment for older persons, the SCSEP is intended to assist older workers in reentering the labor force in unsubsidized employment. The regulations requiring at least 10 percent of the enrollees each year to be placed in unsubsidized jobs is met by all of the national contractors, with NRTA/AARP consistently managing to place 30 to 50 percent--a much higher percentage of placement than other contractors report. Several factors appear to account for this, as judged from discussions with national contractors:

- NRTA/AARP operate in urban areas as contrasted to the Forest Service and Green Thumb, which operate in rural areas. The job market for older workers is generally more extensive in cities than in rural areas.

- Job developers on the NRTA/AARP staff work in each project area.

- NRTA/AARP does not work through subcontractors and hence have more control over the placement of workers than do some other contractors. There may be little incentive for subcontracting organizations to find positions for SCSEP employees outside their organization, and little reason to increase agency costs by paying more salaries than absolutely necessary.

- When NRTA/AARP places SCSEP workers within an organization, the host agency signs an agreement to make a reasonable effort, after a training period, to place some SCSEP workers on its payroll. If this is not done, it is understood that all the SCSEP workers at that agency can be reassigned to another organization.

ROLE OF THE STATE OFFICE ON AGING IN EMPLOYMENT

The role of the State Office on Aging in securing employment for older job seekers has undergone change during the last year. In 1977, 29 state offices took charge of Title IX (SCSEP) funds allotted to the governors of these states. In many instances this was the first time the SOA had given significant attention to older workers.

This year, the Administration on Aging issued the first detailed guidance to State Offices on Aging on employment services to older workers. While the Older Americans Act is under consideration for reauthorization by the Congress this year, alternative means of administering Title IX programs will be debated, with some recommending a much expanded role for the AOA and the State Offices on Aging.

Portions of the annual plans of State Office of Aging which deal with employment of older workers focus mainly on management of the SCSEP often mentioning developing interagency agreements, providing technical assistance to Area Agencies on Aging, and monitoring area agency activities that have SCSEP participants. Some State Offices are planning to promote employment of older people in ways unrelated to the management of the SCSEP program, most often lobbying in behalf of older workers to influence legislation, making improvements in existing employment services for older people, and providing employment for older people within the Office on Aging network.

The activities of several outstanding State Offices on Aging were identified by the project researchers during visits to several states. They are described and discussed elsewhere in this report in sections dealing with (1) Virginia and California's long-range plans on aging, (3) the Washington State survey of older persons to assess their needs for service, (3) the New York State workshop on employment of the elderly, and (4) the Iowa employment projects for older persons (training older people to serve as older worker specialists in State Employment Service local offices, using older persons to conduct survey of pesticides and water supplies).

Administration of Title IX Programs

The National Association of State Units on Aging (NASUA) proposes that "all programs authorized under the Older Americans Act should be administered through the Administrating on Aging and at state option through the Area Agencies on Aging." NASUA's reasons this proposed change, away from administration by DOL and national contractors, will reduce administrative costs and hence make available more job slots. It is claimed that administration by the state and area agencies would ensure coordination of all programs for the elderly within the state.

"There are some States, even some small states, that have five national contractors operating in them now, so what we have developed through this program is not one, but six employment programs for older persons," NASUA points out.

It is also argued that the proposed change will assure equitable treatment of all areas of the state.

"One of the problems was that there is no plan ... drawn up by the national contractors ... They negotiate on how many slots each one is going to have in each state, but there is no joint planning for a comprehensive approach to the state," stated Lou Glasse, director of the New York State Office for the Aging, during oversight hearings on the Older Americans Act, held by the House Select Committee on Aging in October, 1977.

The National Council of Senior Citizens opposes the proposed shift in the administration of Title IX programs to the Administration on Aging and the state and area agencies.

The executive director of the National Council of Senior Citizens, William R. Hutton, made the following statement at the oversight hearings:

"The intention of Title III was that the State and Area Agencies on Aging be the planners and coordinators, and most significantly advocates for the elderly. They were not to operate programs or compete with other public and private agencies for direct funding or control of projects, except in some few instances and then only temporarily.

"We must also question seriously the ability, as well as the propriety, of such agencies acting as both service providers and advocates. If AAA's, the Area Agencies on Aging, perceive their mandate to be the provision of services, there must be a concomitant effort to gather funding to perform this role. However, in the attempt to collect these resources, agea agencies may sacrifice credibility as a planning body. It has become increasingly clear that these roles must be mutually exclusive ... All of us recognize the State Agency on Aging as having a vital contribution to make in terms of planning, coordination and advocacy.

" ... There is nothing to be gained by state and area agencies taking over what is in place and operating effectively under national membership organizations ... The number of part-time opportunities for older people at best will remain the same. More likely, in the light of past experience, the funds will be reduced by higher administrative costs and be diversion to other activities ...

"What happens when Title IX funds go to State Agencies on Aging? They are likely to divide the funds evenly among the Area Agencies on Aging. What's wrong with that?

"First, current economic priorities call for targeting expenditures toward concentrations of high unemployment. Spreading resources thinly results in no visible impact, except on administrative costs ...

"Second, senior aides provided to the area agencies are used largely to supplement area agency staff. That is inconsistent with congressional control of salaries and expenses. If Congress wished to increase staffing in state and area agencies, it could have done so by increasing the funds available for this purpose under Title III. Congress is unlikely to accept staffing by circumvention.

"The poor performance of CETA and report of large-scale politicizing within the program also argue against taking this route for Title IX which has always been and continues to be a clean program.

"One obvious difficulty that arises in considering the appropriate placement of Title IX is that the program combines characteristics of manpower efforts handled in DOL, and social services for the elderly more clearly associated with AOA. Thus it is not surprising that the authorization and administration of the program are split between these two departments.

"In the past, and under different (presidential) administrations, the Labor Department has been noticeably reticent in addressing the problems of the older worker. The CETA program stands out as a glaring example of this neglect. On the other hand, we have reservations about AOA's ability to effectively administer an employment program such as Title IX."

"Handbook on Employment Services for the Elderly"

The Administration on Aging recently issued to state and area agencies the Handbook on Employment Services for the Elderly, developed by Community Research Applications, Inc. Representing the first detailed guidance on employment for Offices on Aging, the handbook is intended "to provide a basic core of 'best practice' information which will assist Network staff to fulfill their service development, technical assistance, and monitoring responsibilities in the provision of services."

Contents of the handbook include:

- "The Importance of Employment Services to Older Persons"--Facts about the employment of older persons, including their need for employment, their job performance, and the problems they face in obtaining employment.

- "The Employment Network"--Review of national programs that affect employment of older persons, including CETA, U.S. Employment Service, SCSEP, ACTION, WIN, and Age Discrimination Act.

- "Service Definitions"--Definition of services that may be provided as part of an employment service, including outreach, intake, assessment, job counseling, referral, job development, job placement, and followup.

- "Alternative Models for Delivery of Employment Services"--Brief description of the plans for providing services by the Employment Service and by voluntary employment agencies (senior nonprofit employment offices).

- "Service Provider Program Operations"--A detailed description of the way an employment agency for older people can be established and operated.

Part of the handbook is devoted to the role of State and Area Agencies on Aging in the provision of employment services. Their responsibilities regarding employment programs are described as (1) program development, (2) advocacy, (3) locating sources of funding, (4) monitoring and assessment, and (5) training and technical assistance.

Comments on Handbook by Project OLDER WORKER Research Staff

The handbook contains information and suggestions that should prove useful to staff members of State and Area Offices on Aging concerned with employment services to older people. Of particular value should be the description of the employment network, the outline of the process of establishing and operating an employment service for older people, and the listing of the many possible sources of funds for programs providing employment help to older people.

We consider the description of the role of the State and Area Agencies on Aging in providing employment services to the elderly to be idealistic, a model that could be used by few State Offices on Aging, given their present funding and priorities. On the one hand, we find that most of the activities recommended by the handbook to State Units on Aging are activities that few or none of the State Offices on Aging are currently carrying out or planning to carry out. These include:

- Identifying key actors.

- Assessing unmet needs and existing employment resources.

- Providing training on older workers' needs

- Educating employers on older workers' capabilities.

- Securing funds for an older worker employment service.
- Gathering data to assess the operation of area agencies' programs.
- Advocating greater involvement of older workers in CETA.
- Opposing discriminatory labor market practices.
- Establishing a senior employment service.

On the other hand, we find that State Offices on Aging commonly engage in certain recommended practices, such as coordination of employment resources, advocating the abolition of mandatory retirement, and monitoring the area agencies.

The Handbook's brief description of the State Employment Security Agency and voluntary nonprofit employment offices lacks much information that might provide a basis for constructive action between the State Office on Aging and these organizations. We suggest that the present technical report could be a useful supplement to the handbook.

Throughout the handbook, the model given for employment services assumes that the client will play a largely passive role. We recognize that this is the reality for many employment offices, as our report shows, but there are different service models described in our report that are appropriate for certain groups of older people, such as displaced homemakers and unemployed professionals and executives.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings from research on older workers, including the Project OLDER WORKER study as well as other recent investigations. Four recommendations are offered for making needed improvements in employment assistance for older job seekers.

1. Provide additional assistance to older job seekers through the State Employment Security Agencies.

2. Promote the use of the State Offices on Aging as centers for planning and coordinating employment services for older workers.

3. Help voluntary nonprofit employment offices to increase their effectiveness.

4. Evaluate the impact of Title IX and CETA on the employment of older persons.

Provide Additional Assistance to Older Job Seekers Through State Employment Security Agencies

Additional assistance should be provided to older applicants through SES local offices. The proportion of SES assistance given to older job seekers has declined markedly since older worker units were abolished. Currently, older job applicants are much less likely than younger applicants to receive referrals and other assistance at SES local offices.

The SES has an important part to play in the employment of certain older workers. It is the main source of help for those older workers who are unemployed and not eligible for a pension and who need full-time, well-paying employment.

Project RENEW, which places trained older worker specialists (funded through Title IX) at local SESA offices should be expanded. This would require a feasibility study to establish how the RENEW concept would work on a large scale. There is the danger that it might lose some of its effectiveness shown during the pilot test. It would seem to be essential to the success of a large-scale Project RENEW operation that additional support be provided by the U.S. Department of Labor and by the individual State Employment Security Agencies.

At the Federal level, the appointment of an Assistant Secretary for Older Worker Programs would add the needed emphasis. Also, each State Employment Security Agency should appoint a full-time supervisor of older worker programs. The state supervisor would need authority to monitor and evaluate services to older workers, including Project RENEW activities.

Promote the Use of State Offices on Aging as Centers for Planning and Coordinating Employment Services for Older Workers

The State Offices on Aging (SOA) have an assigned role of planning and coordinating programs for older persons. No other organization accepts this role, even though there are several manpower agencies in each state and several prime contractors dealing with Senior Community Service Employment Programs. However, many State Offices on Aging give this very low priority.

Increased involvement of state offices in employment assistance activities could be promoted through regional workshops on employment. The workshops could be based largely on the recently released Handbook on Employment Services for the Elderly, prepared for the Administration on Aging. It would be devoted to application of the guidelines given in the handbook, to the sharing of successful older worker employment efforts by the state offices within the region (or other successful programs in other regions). The workshop should lead to some planning by the state offices with later followup on these plans by Regional Offices on Aging.

Also, to increase its planning in the area of employment services, each State Office on Aging should be required to devote a section of its annual plan to needs, goals, and accomplishments in the area of older worker employment. (There is no present requirement to discuss employment in the annual plan.)

Help Voluntary Nonprofit Employment Offices to Increase Their Effectiveness

The effectiveness of the voluntary (senior) nonprofit employment offices should be increased to better serve older job seekers. The survey of employment offices and the survey of applicants to these offices indicated they are typically small-scale operations, seeing only a fraction of the number of older workers that local SES offices see. Voluntary employment offices as a rule have little contact with the local SES office, and seldom does the SES office refer people to the senior office. Direct job placement is the service most commonly provided by voluntary nonprofit employment offices. Applicants who wanted help in areas such as job training and age discrimination usually reported they did not receive it.

The voluntary nonprofit employment office could increase its effectiveness by seeking assistance from the State Offices on Aging. The state office could evaluate the services provided by the voluntary office and advise where improvements could be made, possibly in the areas of providing services to a larger number of older job seekers, and serving the needs of certain groups of job seekers, such as displaced homemakers. The state offices should assist voluntary nonprofit offices in obtaining funding to support added services and staff. In particular, state offices should help senior offices establish better communication with the SES local office. This could lead to referrals by the SES of all older people looking for part-time or temporary employment (the nature of most jobs listed with senior offices), which in turn, would greatly expand the number of older people served.

Many of the applicants at the voluntary nonprofit offices are displaced homemakers, whose needs are generally more complex than just the need for assistance in job placement. A handbook on employment assistance for displaced homemakers should be developed under AOA sponsorship, to be used by state offices and voluntary nonprofit offices.

Also, a handbook on age discrimination in employment should be developed under AOA sponsorship. This handbook would explain the forms of age discrimination most commonly reported, how to deal with suspected or overt age discrimination, including procedures for filing a formal complaint, and the rights of older persons under the law.

Forty Plus clubs provide a valuable kind of job search assistance to unemployed professionals and managers, assistance which they are not likely to obtain elsewhere. However, with few exceptions virtually all Forty Plus members are white males (though their membership rules do not bar blacks or women). State Offices on Aging should encourage Forty Plus clubs to make their job-hunting expertise more widely available, especially to women and blacks who seek professional or administrative positions. The other voluntary nonprofit employment offices could learn from contact with Forty Plus clubs, since some of their clients, too, seek professional or managerial jobs.

Evaluate the Impact of SCSEP and CETA on the Employment of Older Persons

There has been no assessment of the effect of SCSEP and CETA on older workers aside from some information obtained during congressional oversight hearings and program data contained in required statistical reports submitted to the Department of Labor. More complete information on the impact of the programs is essential for program planning.

A study of Title IX and CETA and their impact on older workers should provide information in general areas: (1) a consequence of participation in the programs, (2) the recruiting methods for various kinds of older workers, and (3) the most effective means of administering the programs and factors associated with their effectiveness.

As the level of funding of these programs increases, and as additional organizations are involved in administering these funds, it is all the more imperative that the programs be evaluated to determine how the funds can be spent most effectively. Research to evaluate the effectiveness of CETA and Title IX on older workers should include a longitudinal study of participants as well as the gathering of information on program organization and management.

References

Adams, Leonard P. "Employment Prospects for Older Workers," in *Employment of the Middle-Aged Worker*. 1969, New York: National Council on the Aging, pp. 1-120.

Adler, Joan, *The Retirement Book*, 1975, New York: Morrow.

Administration on Aging, *Older Americans Act of 1965 as Amended and Related Acts*, 1974, Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Administration on Aging, *Employment and Volunteer Opportunities for Older People*, 1975, AOA Fact Sheet, Washington D.C.: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Axelbank, Rashelle G., "The Position of the Older Worker in the American Labor Force", in *Employment of the Middle-Aged Worker*. 1969, New York: National Council on the Aging, pp. 121-280.

Back, Kurt W. "The Ambiguity of Retirement" in *Behavior and Adaptation in Late Life*, Busse and Preiffer (eds), 1969, Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., pp. 93-114.

Bauder, Ward W. and Doerflinger, Jon A. "Work Roles Among the Rural Aged", in *Older Rural Americans*, E. Grant Youmans (ed), 1967, Lexington: University of Kentucky, pp. 22-43.

Birren, J.E. *The Psychology of Aging*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1967.

Brennan, Michael, J., et al, *The Economics of Age*, 1967, New York: Norton.

Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Job Redesign for Older Workers: Ten Case Studies*, 1969, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Butler, Robert N., *Why Survive: Being Old in America*, 1975, New York: Harper and Row.

Carney, Joyce M. *Preretirement Education*, 1974, Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Clague, Ewan, et al, *The Aging Worker and the Union: Employment and Retirement of Middle Aged and Older Workers*, 1971, New York: Draeger.

Cobb, Sidney and Lasl, Stanislav, "Some Medical Aspects of Unemployment", in G. Shatto, Editor, *Employment of the Middle-Aged*, Charles Thomas C., 1972.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare, *Towards a New Attitude on Aging: A Report on the Administration's Continuing Response to the Recommendations of the Delegates to the 1971 White House Conference on Aging*, 1973, Washington, DC: Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, *Serving the Elderly: A Guide for Prime Sponsors*, 1976, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Greene, Mark R., et al. *Early Retirement: Company Policies and Retirees Experiences*, 1969, Washington, DC: Administration on Aging.

Haber, William, Ferman, Louis, and Hudson, James, *The Impact of Technological Change*, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, 1963.

Hulsey, Steve. "Working Seniors Prove Their Meetle", in *Manpower*, 1975, Washington, DC: Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, pp. 23-25.

Jaffee, A.J., "Technology, Opportunity, and the Older Worker" in *Employment of the Middle-Aged Worker*, 1969, New York: National Council on the Aging, pp. 281-341.

Kilmer, Deborah, "Lesislative Development for the Older Worker", in *Proceedings of the Training Institute of the Clearinghouse for Voluntary Employment Agencies for the Aging*, 1975, Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center, pp. 17-19.

Krepes, Juanita M. "Economics of Retirement:, in *Behavior and Adaptation in Late Life*, Busse and Pfeiffer (eds), 1969, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., pp. 71-92.

Leiter, Sarah F., *Training and Employment of the Older Worker: Recent Findings and Recommendations Based on Older Worker Experimental and Demonstration Projects*, 1968, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Louis Harris and Associates, *The Myth and Reality of Aging in America*, 1975, Washington, DC: National Council on the Aging.

McFarland, R.A. and O'Dougherty, B.M., "Work and Occupational Skills", in *Handbook of Aging and the Individual: Psychological and Biological Aspects*, J.E. Birren (ed.), University of Chicago, 1959.

Merriam, Ida, C. "Social Security and Retirement from Work", 1970, Paper Presented at International Social Security Association General Assembly, September, 1970.

Morgan, James, and Barfield, Richard, *Early Retirement: The Decision and the Experience*, 1969, Ann Arbor: Braun, Brumfield.

Morse, Dean, *The Peripheral Worker*, 1969, New York: Columbia University.

National Council on the Aging, *Proceedings of National Conference on Manpower Training and the Older Worker*, 1966, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

National Council on the Aging, *Senior Community Service Project*, 1969, Washington, DC: National Council on the Aging.

National Senior Citizens Law Center, *Legal Issues Affecting the Older Woman in America Today,* 1975, Hearing before the Subcommittee on Retirement Income and Employment, House of Representatives, October 21, 1975, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

New Life Institute, *Retire to Work: A Retirement Job Planning Guide*, 1975a Albertson, NY: New Life Institute, Human Resources Center.

New Life Institute, *Voluntary Employment Agencies for the Aging: A National Listing*, 1975b, Albertson, NY: New Life Institute, Human Resources Center.

Nusberg, Charlotte, "Comparative European Models on the Employment of the Older Worker", in *Proceedings for the Training Institute of the Clearinghouse for Voluntary Employment Agencies for the Aging*, 1975, Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center, pp. 20-27.

Odell, Charles E., "Some Historical Notes on the Development of the U.S. Employment Service Older Worker Program", in *Proceedings of the Training Institute of the Clearinghouse for Voluntary Employment Agencies for the Aging*, 1975, Albertson, NY: Human Resources Center, pp. 28-34.

Palmore, Erdman, "Work Experiences and Earning of the Aged in 1962: Findings of the 1963 Survey of the Aged", 1964, *Social Security Bulletin*, 27, pp. 3-15.

Parnes, Herbert S. and King, "Middle-Aged Job Losers", *Industrial Gerontology*, April 1977.

Rosenblum, Marc, "Recession's Continuing Victim: The Older Worker", Senate Special Committee on Aging, 1976.

Schulz, James H., Retirement: Background and Issues, 1971, Washington, DC: White House Conference on Aging.

Sheppard, Harold L. New Perspectives on Older Workers, 1971, Washington, DC: W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Steiner, Peter O. and Dorfman, Robert, The Economic Status of the Aged, 1957, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Taggart, Robert, III. The Labor Market Impacts of the Private Retirement System, 1973, Washington, DC: George Washington University.

U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Statistical Appendix to Manpower Report of the President, 1975, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Wachtel, Howard M. "Hard-Core Unemployment in Detroit", In Proceedings of the Industrial Relations Research Association, 1965.

White House Conference on Aging, "Employment and Retirement" in Vol II of Proceedings of the 1971 White House Conference on Aging, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, pp. 11-18.

Wilson, Thurlow R. and Richards, John A., Jobs for Veterans with Disabilities, 1975, Manpower R&D Monograph 41, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Wilson, Thurlow R., Richards, John A., and Bercini, Deborah H., Disabled Veterans of the Vietnam Era: Employment Problems and Programs. 1975, Alexandria, VA: Human Resources Research Organization.

Wirtz, W. Willird, The Older American Worker, 1965, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor.

Workplace Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, The Law Against Age Discrimination in Employment, 1970, Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Note: These references were studied in preparing the state of the art review. Some have been cited in the text.

Appendix A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS AND LETTERS

1. Letter to senior nonprofit employment offices requesting their participation in job seeker survey.

2. Instructions to employment office staff for distribution of survey packets.
    a. For senior nonprofit employment offices
    b. For SESA local offices
    c. Letter to Forty Plus offices

3. The survey packet.
    a. Outer envelope of packet
    b. Letter to job applicants
    c. The job seeker questionnaire

4. Telephone interview guide.

5. Letter to senior nonprofit employment offices introducing survey of senior offices.

6. Senior nonprofit employment office questionnaire.

7. Project information sheet.

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

15 March 1977

Eastern Division
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611

Ms. Bernice C. Planto
Director
Senior Employment Service
307 Marshall Street
San Antonio, TX

Dear Ms. Planto:

Thank you for participating in our survey of non-profit employment agencies for older workers. The results of the survey are helping us to form a clearer picture of the range of employment services available to older job-seekers. We are still receiving returns from the survey, but we have performed a preliminary analysis of the data. I am enclosing a summary of the major findings for your information.

We are now in the process of surveying older job-seekers about their job goals and their experiences in looking for work. We feel that this survey will yield data of great practical value for program planners and organizations that offer employment services for older workers. The job-seeker survey is being distributed to applicants at public employment service offices across the nation. However, past studies have shown that a large percentage of those looking for work never turn to the public employment service for assistance. Therefore, to get a more balanced sample we would like to distribute the surveys at some non-profit employment agencies as well.

Your office is one of the non-profit agencies we would like to ask to assist us in our survey of older job-seekers. We realize that your time and the time of your fellow staff members is devoted entirely to providing services to your clients. Therefore, we have designed the job-seeker survey to be completely self administering. If you agree to assist us in the survey, your placement personnel would simply hand a survey packet to each client 55 or older telling them that information on a government-sponsored survey of older worker employment is contained inside. Each client can then complete the form on their own and mail it back to HumRRO in the postage paid envelope provided. The survey is anonymous and voluntary. (A sample survey packet is enclosed.)

We have pretested the survey at several older worker employment agencies and have found that it causes no disruption in normal office routine. Most clients are quite willing to participate, and many have expressed interest in the study.

After we have analyzed the data from the job-seeker survey, we will send you a summary of the findings, including the distribution of responses for all participating offices and a separate table showing the distribution of responses received from your clients. We feel that these analyses will be both informative and useful for future planning.

Thank you for considering this request. I will call you sometime within the next few days to discuss the job-seeker survey in greater detail and to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Thurlow R Wilson

Thurlow R. Wilson, Ph.D.
Director
Project OLDER WORKER

Enclosure

DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECT OLDER WORKER QUESTIONNAIRES

Your office has agreed to participate in the distribution of questionnaires as part of a national study of employment services to older workers (Project OLDER WORKER).

Enclosed are survey packets to be distributed to applicants to your office who are 55 years of age or older. Each survey packet contains: Outer envelope which gives information on the sponsorship of the survey; a letter to the applicant further explaining the purpose of the survey; a questionnaire which takes about 15-20 minutes to complete; and a postage-paid return envelope. Participation of older applicants in the OLDER WORKER survey is voluntary. The questionnaire is self-administering and anonymous. It may be completed at a time and place convenient to the applicant and then returned directly to the Human Resources Research Organization in the addressed, postage-paid envelope.

1. The survey packets should be handed out to the next job applicants to your office who are 55 years old or older. Please do not select applicants on any basis other than age.

2. The survey packets should be handed out until the supply is exhausted.

3. The employment office personnel handing out the questionnaire should be sure to tell each older job-seeker the following:

   a) Your office has been asked to distribute a government-sponsored survey on the employment needs of older job-seekers.

   b) Participation in the survey is voluntary and anonymous.

   c) More information on the survey and the questionnaire is in the packet.

Our pilot test showed that the vast majority of older applicants agreed to take the survey packet. Employment office personnel handing out the questionnaires should project a positive attitude toward the study but they do not need to "sell" it to the applicant. A brief, straightforward explanation containing the three points given above should be sufficient.

We very much appreciate your cooperation. After completion of the survey, we will be sending to your office a summary of the responses given to the questionnaire by your applicants.

Project OLDER WORKER is being conducted under a grant from the Administration of Aging (DHEW) and with the cooperation of the U. S. Department of Labor.

For further information concerning Project OLDER WORKER, contact Dr. Thurlow R. Wilson, Director, Project OLDER WORKER, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314; telephone: (703) 549-3611.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Employment Service Local Office Managers

FROM: Dr. Thurlow R. Wilson, Director of Project OLDER WORKER, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Va. Telephone (703) 549-3611

DATE: 15 March 1977

SUBJECT: Instructions for distribution of questionnaires to older workers (as arranged through USES Field Memorandum 115-77 and explained by USES Information Bulletin 77-3. Subject: Administrating on Aging Study of Employment Services to Older Workers.)

We have been notified by the Department of Labor Regional Office that your office has agreed to participate in the distribution of questionnaires as part of a national study of employment services to older workers.

Enclosed are   survey packets to be distributed to applicants to your office who are 55 years of age or older. Each survey packet contains: Outer envelope which gives information on the sponsorship of the survey; a letter to the applicant further explaining the purpose of the survey; a questionnaire which takes about 15-20 minutes to complete; and a postage-paid return evenlope. Participation of older applicants in the OLDER WORKER survey is voluntary. The questionnaire is self-administering and anonymous. It may be completed at a time and place convenient to the applicant and then returned directly to the Human Resources Research Organization in the addressed, postage-paid envelope.

1. The survey packets should be handed out to the next   applicants to your office who are 55 years old or older. Please do not select applicants on any basis other than age. U.I. claimants may be considered employment service applicants for the purpose of this study.

2. The survey packets should be handed out until the supply is exhausted.

3. The employment office personnel handing out the questionnaires should be sure to tell each older job-seeker the following:

    a) Your office has been asked to distribute a government-sponsored survey on the employment needs of older job-seekers.

    b) Participation in the survey is voluntary and anonymous.

    c) More information on the survey and the questionnaire is in the packet.

Our pilot test showed that the vast majority of older applicants agreed to take the survey packet. Employment office personnel handing out the questionnaires should project a positive attitude toward the study but they do not need to "sell" it to the applicant. A brief, straightforward explanation containing the three points given above should be sufficient.

We very much appreciate your cooperation. If you have any questions or problems with the survey distribution please call me collect at the number given above.

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

1 April 1977

300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611

Ms. Pat Slater
Executive Director
Forty Plus of Houston
2903 Richmond Avenue
Houston, TX 77098

Dear Ms. Slater:

Thank you for agreeing to distribute OLDER WORKER questionnaires to your active members. As you suggested, I have enclosed 35 survey packets. I also enclose three copies of the project information sheet.

You may wish to follow the procedure used by the Forty Plus of New York in distributing the survey to their active members:

1. During the weekly meeting, the survey was mentioned. "A survey of employment experiences and needs of older job seekers is being conducted under sponsorship of the Administration on Aging (DHEW). Our organization has agreed to distribute survey forms to the active members. The survey is voluntary and anonymous. All explanations of the survey are enclosed along with each survey form. The form takes about 20 minutes to fill out. The survey is part of Project OLDER WORKER and you can learn more about Project OLDER WORKER from the blue information sheet."

2. The survey materials were placed in the mail box of each active member. (Even though our study focuses on those 55 or older, we asked that the form be given to all active members, regardless of age.)

3. The members could then complete the survey form if they wished and return it to HumRRO in the envelope provided.

Thank you for your help with Project OLDER WORKER. In a few months I will send you a computer-prepared summary of the responses of your active members to the survey.

Sincerely yours,

Thurlow R Wilson

Thurlow R. Wilson, Ph.D.
Senior Staff Scientist

Enclosures

TRW/jcp

Project OLDER WORKER Survey

Your Opinions and Experiences on Employment are IMPORTANT

TELL US ABOUT THEM BY FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE INSIDE THIS ENVELOPE. PLEASE MAIL YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE TO US TODAY. A POSTAGE-PAID RETURN ENVELOPE IS PROVIDED.

THANK YOU

Project OLDER WORKER is being conducted by HumRRO for the Administration on Aging (DHEW) with the cooperation of the U.S. Department of Labor. HumRRO is an independent, non-profit research company.

OUTER ENVELOPE OF JOB SEEKER SURVEY PACKET

HumRRO
HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611

Dear Job Applicant:

Why do so many people over 55 years of age (more than two-thirds of a million according to January figures) have such a hard time finding work? What employment services could be provided or improved to help reduce unemployment among job seekers in this age group? The U.S. Administration on Aging would like your help in providing answers to these and other related questions.

Would you please take a few minutes of your time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and mail it in the envelope provided - no postage is necessary. We are handing out a very small number of questionnaires compared to the number of people over 55 who are looking for work, *so each questionnaire is important.* We hope you will give us the benefit of your experience.

Thank you for your help. I wish you every success in achieving your own employment goal.

Sincerely,

Thurlow R. Wilson
Director
Project OLDER WORKER

Enclosure.

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611

Dear Forty Plus Member:

Why do people over 40 years of age with valuable professional and managerial experience have such a hard time finding suitable work? What employment services could be provided or improved to help reduce unemployment among job seekers in this age group? The U.S. Administration on Aging would like your help in providing answers to these and other related questions. This survey of older workers is being carried out through selected Forty Plus offices, public employment offices, and non-profit senior employment offices.

Would you please take a few minutes of your time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and mail it in the envelope provided—no postage is necessary. We are handing out a small number of questionnaires, so each questionnaire is important. We hope you will give us the benefit of your experience.

Thank you for your help. I wish you every success in achieving your own employment goal.

Sincerely,

Thurlow R Wilson

Thurlow R. Wilson
Director
Project OLDER WORKER

Enclosure

ID ____________________ Office ____________________

Project OLDER WORKER Questionnaire

MARK ANSWERS LIKE THIS ☒ OR WRITE IN. ALL REPLIES ARE CONFIDENTIAL.

1. Please describe your present job. If not working now, describe your last job. cc

a. What kind of work do (did) you do? (For example, salesperson, interviewer, carpenter)

____

b. What are (were) your major activities or duties on this job? (For example, sell shoes, interview applicants, build forms)

____ 7

____

c. Were you:

1 ☐ An employee of a PRIVATE Company, business or individual
2 ☐ A GOVERNMENT employee (federal, state, county, or local)
3 ☐ Self-employed in OWN business, professional practice, or farm 8
4 ☐ Working in FAMILY business or farm

d. How many hours do (did) you usually work per week on this job? ____ hours per week 9-10

e. How much do (did) you usually earn at this job before deductions? 11-15

→ Amount $________ every ________ (hour, week, month or year) 16

f. What year did you start working at this job? 19______ 17-18

g. Are you still working at this job?

m ☐ Yes
☐ No → Date you left this job: Month ________ Year 19____ 19

→ Why did you happen to leave this job? (Mark only ONE answer) 20-21

1 ☐ I decided to retire
2 ☐ I was laid off
3 ☐ I sold or gave up my business
4 ☐ A temporary job ended
5 ☐ I was forced to retire by company policy
6 ☐ I had to quit because of illness
7 ☐ I quit in order to look for a better job
8 ☐ Other reason (Explain) 22

____

____

2. When did you begin your current job search? → Month ________ Year 197___ 23 24

3. Why did you start looking for work? (Mark Only ONE Answer)

1 ☐ I was bored and wanted to go back to work
2 ☐ I had to go back to work in order to make ends meet
3 ☐ My health improved and I am able to work again
4 ☐ To find a better job
5 ☐ To find a second job (in addition to the one I have)
6 ☐ I plan to retire and want a job after I retire
7 ☐ Other reason. → (Explain below) 25

____

____

cc

4. **Is there any reason why you could not take a job this week?**

1 ☐ No
☐ Yes → Why? 2 ☐ Already have a job
3 ☐ Temporary illness
4 ☐ In school or training
5 ☐ Other reason. (Explain) ____________________ 26

5. **Do you think that any of the employers you have contacted were not willing to consider you for a job—simply because of your age?**

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes
3 ☐ I haven't contacted any employers 27

6. **Below are kinds of help some people get in an employment office. Mark ALL the kinds of help you wanted when you came to this office.**

28 ☐ A. Someone to find and contact employers who might be interested in hiring me. 28
29 ☐ B. Information or advice about job training. 29
30 ☐ C. Information about job opportunities in other cities. 30
31 ☐ D. Someone to help me decide what kinds of work I should look for. 31
32 ☐ E. Advice on how to act in employment interviews. 32
33 ☐ F. Tips on writing a good resume. 33
34 ☐ G. A list of job openings I can look over myself. 34
35 ☐ H. Someone to help me overcome my discouraged feeling. 35
36 ☐ I. Someone I can talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers. 36
37 ☐ J. Tips on how to "sell myself" to an employer. 37
38 ☐ K. Advice on how to find good job leads. 38
39 ☐ L. Advice on how to deal with age discrimination. 39
40 ☐ M. If you wanted some other kind of help from the employment office, please describe: ____________________ 40

7. **Look back at the kinds of help listed in A through M above. What kind of help did you want most when you came to this employment office?**

Write the letter of the one kind of help you wanted most: ____________ 41

8. **How satisfied are you with the help you have received in this employment office?**

1 ☐ Haven't received help yet so I can't really say
2 ☐ Very satisfied
3 ☐ Somewhat satisfied
4 ☐ Unsatisfied 42
5 ☐ Very unsatisfied

9. **What was your TOTAL FAMILY INCOME in 1976?**

> **TOTAL FAMILY INCOME**
>
> **– your income and the income of family members living with you**
> **– include income from all sources—wages, social security, dividends, pensions, etc.**

1 ☐ Under 2,000
2 ☐ $2,000 to $3,999
3 ☐ $4,000 to $5,999
4 ☐ $6,000 to $7,999
5 ☐ $8,000 to $9,999
6 ☐ $10,000 to $14,999 43
7 ☐ $15,000 to $19,999
8 ☐ $20,000 to $24,999
9 ☐ $25,000 to $34,999
0 ☐ $35,000 and over 43

cc

10. What would your total family income be per year if you did not work?

1 ☐ Under $2,000 a year
2 ☐ $2,000 to $3,999
3 ☐ $4,000 to $5,999
4 ☐ $6,000 to $7,999
5 ☐ $8,000 to $9,999
6 ☐ $10,000 to $14,999
7 ☐ $15,000 to $19,999
8 ☐ $20,000 to $24,999
9 ☐ $25,000 to $34,999
0 ☐ $35,000 and over 44

11. If you did not work, how well could your family manage?

1 ☐ Very well 45
2 ☐ Fairly well
3 ☐ With difficulty
4 ☐ With great difficulty
5 ☐ Not at all

12. If, by some chance you were to get enough money to live comfortably without working, do you think that you would work anyway?

1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes 3 ☐ Don't know 46

13. Now, about the job you are looking for:

a. Do you have a particular kind of work in mind?

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes → Describe the kind of work you are seeking. Please be specific (for example, foreman in a machine shop, secretary in a law firm, etc.). 47

____

____

b. How many hours do you want to work each week? → _____ hours per week 48-49

c. Approximately what salary are you asking for? 50-54

$________ per ____________________ 55
(amount) (hour, week, month, or year)

d. What is the MINIMUM salary that you will accept? 56-60

$________ per ____________________
(amount) (hour, week, month, or year)

e. What restrictions would you place on the job? Mark ALL the things you would not want in a job.

61 ☐ Evening or night work 61
62 ☐ Lifting 20 pounds or more 62
63 ☐ Work requiring travel out of town 63
64 ☐ A job that would require me to move to another city 64
65 ☐ Work requiring overtime 65
66 ☐ A job that would take more than 30 minutes to get to 66
67 ☐ A job that I could not reach by public transportation 67
68 ☐ A high pressure job (for example, deadlines, a demanding boss) 68
☐ Other (please specify): ______________________________

f. How confident are you that you will soon find the job you seek?

1 ☐ Very confident
2 ☐ Somewhat confident
3 ☐ Not confident or discouraged 69
4 ☐ Somewhat discouraged
5 ☐ Very discouraged

cc

14. Have you ever retired from a job? 70–71

01 ☐ No

☐ Yes → Give year: 19_____ 72

→ Did your employer force you to retire? 1 ☐ No 2 ☐ Yes

PLEASE FILL IN THE FOLLOWING ITEMS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION

15. In what year were you born? __________ 73–74

16. What is the highest level of schoolling you have completed? 75

1 ☐ Less than 8th grade
2 ☐ Some high school, but did not graduate
3 ☐ High school graduate
4 ☐ Some college, but did not graduate
5 ☐ College graduate
6 ☐ Advanced degree

17. Are you: 76

1 ☐ Married
2 ☐ Single (never been married)
3 ☐ Separated
4 ☐ Divorced
5 ☐ Widowed

18. What is your race? 77

1 ☐ White 2 ☐ Black 3 ☐ Other

19. Are you: 78

1 ☐ Male 2 ☐ Female

20. Does your health or physical condition limit the kind or amount of work you can do? 79

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes → In what way? ______________________________

____

____

If you would like to tell us more about your job hunting experiences, write us a letter and mail it with your questionnaire. PLEASE MAIL YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE in the postage-paid envelope provided.

You do not have to put your name on this questionnaire. We will be interviewing by telephone some job seekers who volunteer to give their names. If you are willing to be interviewed, please write your name and telephone number below:

Name: ______________________________ 80

Telephone: ______________________________
Area Code Number

Human Resources Research Organization • 300 N. Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Project OLDER WORKER

Telephone Interview Guide

Name ______________________________ Code ______________

Phone ______________ Began ______________ Ended ______________

Employment Agency and Location ______________________________

1. AT THE TIME YOU FILLED OUT OUR QUESTIONNAIRE, YOU SAID THAT YOU WERE OUT OF A JOB. ARE YOU STILL OUT OF A JOB?

- No. *(GO TO QUESTION 2)*
- Yes. ARE YOU ACTIVELY LOOKING FOR WORK NOW?
  - Yes. IS THERE ANY REASON WHY YOU COULD NOT TAKE A JOB THIS WEEK?
    - No. *(GO TO QUESTION 6)*
    - Yes. WHY COULDN'T YOU TAKE A JOB THIS WEEK?
      - ☐ Already working
      - ☐ Temporary illness
      - ☐ Other

        (GO TO QUESTION 6)
  - No. WHAT IS THE REASON WHY YOU ARE NO LONGER LOOKING FOR WORK?
    - ☐ Gave up, discouraged. (Probe)
    - ☐ Starting new job in near future.
    - ☐ Too ill or feeble to work anymore.
    - ☐ Receiving social security or other income so don't need to work.
    - ☐ Just don't want to work anymore.
    - ☐ Other

      (GO TO QUESTION 9)

2. WHAT KIND OF WORK ARE YOU DOING NOW? ______________________________

WHAT ARE YOUR MAJOR ACTIVITIES ON THIS JOB? ______________________________

____

HOW MANY HOURS A WEEK DO YOU WORK ON THIS JOB? ______________

3. WHEN YOU WERE LOOKING FOR WORK, DID YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC KIND OF JOB IN MIND OR DID YOU HAVE ONLY A GENERAL IDEA OF THE SORT OF WORK YOU WANTED TO DO?

[ ] Specific. WHAT PARTICULAR KIND OF WORK WERE YOU HOPING TO FIND? ____________

____

WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR SEEKING WORK AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ RATHER THAN SOME OTHER KIND OF WORK?

____

____

____

(If current job is different than kind of work sought, ask)

I NOTICE THAT THE JOB YOU HAVE NOW IS DIFFERENT THAN THE KIND OF JOB YOU HAD IN MIND AS YOU WERE LOOKING FOR WORK. WHY DID YOU TAKE A JOB AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ INSTEAD OF THE KIND OF JOB YOU WERE HOPING TO FIND?

____

____

[ ] General. COULD YOU TELL ME ANYTHING ABOUT THE SORT OF WORK YOU WERE LOOKING FOR?

____

____

____

(NOTE: For question #4, Full-Time work = 30 hours per week or more; Part-Time work = < 30 hours per week. See Question 2)

4. THE JOB YOU HAVE NOW IS A (PART-TIME/FULL-TIME) JOB. WHEN YOU WERE LOOKING FOR WORK, DID YOU HAVE IN MIND A PART-TIME OR A FULL-TIME JOB?

[ ] Full-Time.

[ ] Part-Time. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR WANTING A PART-TIME RATHER THAN A FULL-TIME JOB?

____

____

(If current hours are different from desired hours, ask:)

WHY DID YOU TAKE A _ _ _ _-TIME JOB INSTEAD OF THE _ _ _ _-TIME JOB YOU WERE LOOKING FOR?

5. LOOKING BACK OVER THE YEARS, WHAT HAS BEEN YOUR MAIN OCCUPATION? (If you need to clarify, say "THE WORK YOU'VE DONE LONGEST." If no previous paid employment, i.e., housewife or volunteer worker, *SKIP TO QUESTION 9.*)

WHAT WERE YOUR MAJOR ACTIVITIES OR DUTIES DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?

(If different than current job, ask:)

I NOTICE THAT THIS IS DIFFERENT THAN YOUR WORK NOW AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _. WHAT WERE YOUR REASONS FOR TAKING A JOB AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ RATHER THAN THE KIND OF WORK YOU HAVE DONE THE LONGEST?

SKIP TO QUESTION 9

(If still out of a job and looking for work, ask:)

6. AS YOU LOOK FOR WORK, DO YOU HAVE A SPECIFIC KIND OF JOB IN MIND OR DO YOU HAVE ONLY A GENERAL IDEA OF THE SORT OF WORK YOU WANT TO DO?

☐ Specific. WHAT PARTICULAR KIND OF WORK ARE YOU HOPING TO FIND?

WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS FOR SEEKING WORK AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ RATHER THAN SOME OTHER KIND OF WORK?

[ ] General. COULD YOU TELL ME ANYTHING ABOUT THE SORT OF WORK YOU ARE LOOKING FOR?

____

____

____

7. AS YOU LOOK FOR WORK, DO YOU HAVE IN MIND A PART-TIME JOB OR A FULL-TIME JOB?

[ ] Full-Time.

[ ] Part-Time. WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS FOR WANTING TO TAKE A PART-TIME JOB INSTEAD OF A FULL-TIME JOB?

____

____

8. LOOKING BACK OVER THE YEARS, WHAT HAS BEEN YOUR MAIN OCCUPATION? (If no previous paid employment, i.e., housewife or volunteer worker, *GO TO QUESTION 9*).

____

WHAT WERE YOUR MAJOR DUTIES OR ACTIVITIES IN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?

____

____

____

(If different than the kind of work sought, ask:)

I NOTICE THAT THIS IS DIFFERENT THAN THE KIND OF WORK YOU ARE HOPING TO FIND. WHAT ARE YOUR REASONS FOR LOOKING FOR WORK AS A _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ RATHER THAN THE KIND OF JOB YOU HAVE DONE THE LONGEST?

____

____

____

9. ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE WE ASKED YOU ABOUT THE KIND OF HELP YOU WANTED WHEN YOU WENT TO THE _(name of private office)_ OFFICE. YOU CHECKED _(read first response checked below)_ . DID YOU GET THAT KIND OF HELP?

(Read remaining items checked below and after each, ask:) DID YOU GET THIS KIND OF HELP?

	Wanted	Got	
A.	( )	Y N	Someone to find and contact employers who might be interested in hiring me. ________
B.	( )	Y N	Information or advice about job training. ________
C.	( )	Y N	Information about job opportunities in other cities. ________
D.	( )	Y N	Someone to help me decide what kinds of work I should look for. ________
E.	( )	Y N	Advice on how to act in employment interviews. ________
F.	( )	Y N	Tips on writing a good resume. ________
G.	( )	Y N	A list of job openings I can look over myself. ________
H.	( )	Y N	Someone to help me overcome my discouraged feeling. ________
I.	( )	Y N	Someone I can talk with who understands the personal problems of older job seekers. ________
J.	( )	Y N	Tips on how to "sell myself" to an employer. ________
K.	( )	Y N	Advice on how to find good job leads. ________
L.	( )	Y N	Advice on how to deal with age discrimination. ________
M.	( )	Y N	Other ________

10. YOU INDICATED THAT THE KIND OF HELP YOU WANTED MOST WAS _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _.

IF GOT HELP: WHAT DID THE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE DO TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THIS KIND OF HELP? ______________________________

____

____

IF DIDN'T GET HELP: WHY WASN'T THE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE ABLE TO PROVIDE YOU WITH THE HELP YOU WANTED? ______________________________

____

____

11. OVERALL, WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE HELP YOU GOT AT THE _ (Name of private office) _ _ WAS: (Read list below)

( ) Excellent
( ) Good
( ) Fair
( ) Poor
( ) No help at all

12. COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHY YOU FEEL THAT THE HELP PROVIDED AT THIS OFFICE WAS _ (above rating) _ _? (Probe for specific reasons such as service, knowledge about needs of older workers, etc.)

____

____

____

____

13. DURING YOUR RECENT JOB SEARCH, HAVE YOU GONE TO A STATE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE FOR HELP IN FINDING WORK?

( ) Yes. WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU WENT THERE?

______________________________ *(SKIP TO QUESTION 15)*

( ) No. (*ASK QUESTION 14*)

(Ask only of those who answered "No" to Question #13.)

14. WHY DIDN'T YOU GO TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE FOR JOB HELP? (Probe for specific reasons such as location, service, knowledge about needs of older workers, suitability of jobs, etc. After each response, ask "ANYTHING ELSE?" After getting full response *SKIP TO QUESTION 17.*)

____

____

188

____

15. OVERALL, WOULD YOU SAY THAT THE HELP YOU GOT AT THE STATE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE WAS: (Read list below)

( ) Excellent
( ) Good
( ) Fair
( ) Poor
( ) No help at all

16. COULD YOU EXPLAIN WHY YOU FEEL THAT THE STATE EMPLOYMENT OFFICE HELP WAS ___(above rating)___? (Probe for specific reasons such as service, knowledge about needs of older workers, etc.)

____

____

____

17. DURING YOUR RECENT JOB SEARCH, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY JOBS HAVE YOU APPLIED FOR:

____

ABOUT HOW MANY OF THOSE INVOLVED PERSONAL INTERVIEWS WITH EMPLOYERS?

____

18. (If questionnaire response to Item 5 was "No" or "I haven't contacted any employers, ask A below. If response was "Yes," ask Question B.)

A. SINCE YOU FILLED OUT OUR QUESTIONNARIE, HAVE YOU CONTACTED ANY EMPLOYERS THAT YOU THOUGHT WERE NOT WILLING TO CONSIDER YOU FOR A JOB SIMPLY BECAUSE OF YOUR AGE?

( ) No. (End interview here)

( ) Yes. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE WHAT EMPLOYERS HAVE SAID OR DONE TO GIVE YOU THAT IMPRESSION? (Probe for specific details, e.g., "COULD YOU TELL ME MORE ABOUT THAT?" "HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?" etc.)

____

____

____

B. IN YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE YOU INDICATED THAT YOU THOUGHT SOME EMPLOYERS WERE NOT WILLING TO HIRE YOU FOR A JOB SIMPLY BECAUSE OF YOUR AGE. WOULD YOU DESCRIBE WHAT EMPLOYERS HAVE SAID OR DONE TO GIVE YOU THAT IMPRESSION? (Probe for specific details, e.g., "COULD YOU TELL ME MORE ABOUT THAT?" "HOW OFTEN DID THIS HAPPEN?" etc.)

____

____

____

19. COULD YOU DESCRIBE IN DETAIL ONE SPECIFIC INSTANCE WHEN YOU FELT YOU WERE DISCRIMINATED AGAINST BECAUSE OF YOUR AGE? (Probe: WHAT KIND OF A JOB WAS THIS? DO YOU FEEL YOU WERE OTHERWISE QUALIFIED? DID EMPLOYER MENTION AGE? WERE YOU INTERVIEWED FOR THE JOB?)

THAT'S ALL THE QUESTIONS I HAVE. THANK YOU FOR TAKING THE TIME TO TALK TO ME.

INTERVIEWER COMMENTS:

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

25 January 1977

Eastern Division
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 549-3611

Iris T. Rache
Director, CETA Center
Senior Adult Employment Service
5633 Leesburg Pike
Bailey's Crossroads, VA 22041

Dear Ms. Rache:

The Human Resources Research Organization, under a grant from the Administration on Aging, is conducting a study on the employment of older workers. As part of that study we are surveying non-profit employment agencies for older job seekers to learn how they operate and what significant problems they encounter in trying to place older workers (see the enclosed information sheet for a full description of the study).

Your office is one of 80 non-profit employment agencies included in our nationwide survey. We would like to ask you to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us sometime within the next few days. Also, it would help us to gain a more complete picture of your organization if you could send some additional information along with the questionnaire. Copies of some of your standard publications and forms (for example, an information brochure, an annual report, sample application and counseling forms, etc.) would be most helpful. Please return the questionnaire and any additional information in the enclosed envelope -- no postage is necessary.

We hope you will be able to respond to our survey. We have relatively few non-profit employment agencies in our sample, so each response is important. If you have questions about the study or the questionnaire that are not answered by the enclosed materials, please call me collect at (703) 549-3611.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Thurlow R. Wilson
Director, Project OLDER WORKER

Enclosures.

Project OLDER WORKER:

Survey of Non-Profit Employment Agencies for Older Workers

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. This survey is being conducted by the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) for the Administration on Aging, an agency of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
2. The questionnaire should be completed by the employment office director or another person thoroughly familiar with the operations of the Office.
3. If you have them available, we also would like to have copies of some of your standard publications and forms, such as a brochure describing the services provided by your office, an annual report, sample application and counseling forms, etc.
4. When you have completed the questionnaire, please return it to:
   Thurlow R. Wilson; Project OLDER WORKER; Human Resources Research Organization; 300 North Washington Street; Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

Name and address of employment office:

____

____

____

Name and title of person completing this form:

____

Human Resources Research Organization • 300 N. Washington Street • Alexandria, Virginia 22314

cc

Structure of Your Employment Office 1-3

1. In what year was this employment office established? 19 ________ 4-5

2. (a) What is the total annual budget of this employment office for the current year?
Amount (approximate if necessary): $ ____________ per year 6-8

(b) In the space below, please describe the one source from which this employment office receives most of its financial support. 9-10

____

____

3. Many offices provide employment assistance as only one part of a larger program of services to older job seekers. Approximately how much time is spent on employment assistance for older job seekers at this office? 11

1 ☐ Almost all time, or employment assistance is only service offered
2 ☐ Three-quarters of office time
3 ☐ Half of office time
4 ☐ Less than half of office time

4. (a) What is the total number of people who work at this office? (Include paid staff and volunteers) ____________ 12-13

(b) How many of these work full time? ____________ 14-15

(c) How many are volunteer workers (receive no pay for their work)? ____________ 16-17

(d) How many people are usually directly involved in job placement activities for older workers at any one time? ____________ 18-19

5. Does this office have a Board of Governors, Board of Trustees, government department, organization, or some other governing body to which it is directly responsible? 20

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes As standard office procedure, does the governing body require any of the following? Mark all requirements which apply to this office.

21 ☐ Monthly submission of reports, financial records, etc. 21
22 ☐ Quarterly or yearly submission of reports, financial records, etc. 22
23 ☐ Approval of any changes in program policy 23
24 ☐ Approval of any changes or modifications in the actual program of services offered to older people 24
25 ☐ Approval of administrative expenditures 25
26 ☐ Approval of any changes in personnel policy 26
27 ☐ Approval of any changes in office staff or daily office procedure 27
28 ☐ Other (Please specify) ______________________ 28

Clients

6. Are the employment services provided by this office restricted to any particular group (age, sex, club membership, etc.)? 29

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes. Who is eligible? ______________________

7. On the average, approximately how many new applicants does this office receive per month? 30-32

____

8. We would like to know something about the characteristics of persons served by this office. For each category listed below, please estimate the proportion of your clients in that category by circling the corresponding letter on the scale.

	None (0%)	A few (1-15%)	Some (16-40%)	Half (41-60%)	Many (61-85%)	Most (86-99%)	All (100%)	cc
Male	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	33
Under 55 years of age	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	34
55 to 64	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	35
65 and over	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	36
Less than high school graduate	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	37
High school graduate	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	38
College graduate	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	39
White	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	40
Seeking part-time work	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	41
Previous employment white collar (professional, technical, sales, etc.)	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	42

9. Using the list below as a guide, please indicate the three most common ways applicants learn about your office. Rank your choices by placing the corresponding letters in the spaces provided below the list.

A. Referred by the State Employment Security Agency
B. Learn by word of mouth
C. Referred by other employment offices or agencies
D. Through advertising in the media
E. From senior citizen organizations or other civic groups
F. Other (Please specify: ____________________)

1. Most common way applicants learn about your office ________ 43
2. Second most common way applicants learn about your office ________ 44
3. Third most common way applicants learn about your office ________ 45

Jobs

10. Does your office maintain a file of job listings?

1 ☐ No 46
2 ☐ Yes. How are these listings obtained? (Check all that apply)
    47 ☐ From the State Employment Security Agency 47
    48 ☐ Employers list job openings with us 48
    49 ☐ We engage in job development 49
    50 ☐ Government job vacancy notices 50
    51 ☐ Want ads 51
    52 ☐ Other (Please specify: ______________________________) 52

cc

11. If employers list job openings with your office, please look over the occupational categories below and give the letter for the three kinds of work most frequently listed and the three kinds of work least frequently listed.

A. Professional
B. Technical
C. Managerial/Administrative
D. Sales
E. Clerical
F. Crafts (carpenter, welder, etc.)
G. Machine/heavy equipment operator
H. Transportation operative (driver)
I. Labor, except farm
J. Household worker (companion and child care included)
K. Services, except household
L. Farm work

Three Most Frequently Listed Job Openings (Give letters)

_________ 53
_________ 54
_________ 55

Three Least Frequently Listed Job Openings (Give letters)

_________ 56
_________ 57
_________ 58

12. What kinds of jobs do the applicants to your office usually seek? Look over the list in question 11 above and indicate the three most commonly sought kinds of work by placing the corresponding letters in the spaces below.

1. _________ 2. _________ 3. _________ 59-61

13. In your contacts with employers, have you found them to be: (Check one response) 62

1 ☐ Generally receptive to the idea of hiring older workers?
2 ☐ Generally reluctant to consider older workers?
3 ☐ About evenly divided among those willing to consider older applicants and those reluctant to consider older applicants?

14. In those instances when employers appear reluctant to consider older job seekers, how is their reluctance expressed? Please give a few typical examples, including the more subtle forms of resistance.

____
____
____
____

15. What kind of employers do you think are most likely to be reluctant to hire older workers (for example: banks, manufacturers, retail stores, etc.; large firms or small companies; government or private industry; companies with certain kinds of retirement rules or pension requirements; etc.)?

____ 63-64
____

Records

16. Does your office keep records on the services provided job applicants? 65

1 ☐ No
2 ☐ Yes. What kinds of records? (Check all that apply)

- 66 ☐ Dates of applicant's visits 66
- 67 ☐ Kinds of services provided 67
- 68 ☐ Specific job referrals 68
- 69 ☐ Results of job referrals 69
- 70 ☐ Referrals to other agencies 70
- 71 ☐ Interviewer's or counselor's evaluation 71
- 72 ☐ Assessment of applicant's employment needs 72
- 73 ☐ Follow-up contacts after placement 73
- 74 ☐ Other records (Please specify: _______________________________ 74
____)

cc

Services to Applicants

17. Below is a list of services which employment offices may provide to applicants. For each service, please indicate whether your office gives that service to none, a few, some, most, or all of your applicants by circling the corresponding letter.

Circle one letter on each line

Office Provides Service to:	None	A few	Some	Most	All	cc
Develop job openings for applicants	A	B	C	D	E	75
Match applicant's qualifications to job listings	A	B	C	D	E	76
Provide list of jobs for applicants to study	A	B	C	D	E	77
Talk to an employer in behalf of a job applicant	A	B	C	D	E	78
Test and assess applicant's abilities and aptitudes	A	B	C	D	E	79
Advise or inform about job training	A	B	C	D	E	80
Provide training on job skills	A	B	C	D	E	1
Counsel on job choice	A	B	C	D	E	2
Counsel on personal problems (family, legal, health)	A	B	C	D	E	3
Refer to social service agencies	A	B	C	D	E	4
Assist in applying for benefits (social security, etc.)	A	B	C	D	E	5
Provide information on how to apply for a job	A	B	C	D	E	6
Provide practice or training on applying for a job	A	B	C	D	E	7
Give advice on dealing with age discrimination	A	B	C	D	E	8
Give advice on finding good job leads	A	B	C	D	E	9
Provide classes on post-retirement planning	A	B	C	D	E	10
Follow-up after job referral to determine outcome	A	B	C	D	E	11
Follow-up after individual has been on the job	A	B	C	D	E	12
Give other applicant service. Describe: ____________	A	B	C	D	E	13

____

____

Dealings With the State Employment Service

18. The last question concerns your dealings with the State Employment Service (SES). Below are listed a number of activities. For each activity indicate how often that activity occurs by circling the appropriate letter.

Circle one letter on each line

	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Often	Very often	cc
SES refers applicants to our office	A	B	C	D	E	14
Our office refers clients to SES	A	B	C	D	E	15
Our office and SES exchange information on the job market	A	B	C	D	E	16
Our office and SES exchange information on older job seekers	A	B	C	D	E	17
SES staff advises us on the operation of our office	A	B	C	D	E	18
Our office has some other dealings with the SES	A	B	C	D	E	19

(Explain: ______________________________

______________________________________)

Thank You For Your Cooperation

PROJECT OLDER WORKER

"AN ANALYSIS OF EMPLOYMENT SERVICES TO OLDER JOB SEEKERS"

The Human Resources Research Organization, under a grant from the Administration on Aging (DHEW) and with the cooperation of the Department of Labor, is conducting a study of the employment of job-seekers 55 years of age or older. The nation-wide study will provide data on the employment needs of older workers as well as the public and private employment assistance programs available to them. Recommendations concerning employment assistance efforts on behalf of older workers are expected.

The research project, code-named OLDER WORKER, will include: (1) a nationwide survey of older job seekers; (2) an analysis of voluntary, non-profit employment offices throughout the nation (the focus here will be on the population served, how the offices are organized and funded, the major problems they encounter in placing older workers, and the degree to which they interact with the State Employment Agency); (3) an analysis of services for older workers provided by State Employment Security Agencies; and (4) an examination of the Offices on Aging in several states to determine their role in facilitating the employment of older job seekers.

Project OLDER WORKER will have several products. A comprehensive final report will present the results and recommendations of the study. An executive summary, intended for distribution to public administrators and policy makers, will highlight major conclusions of policy significance. A practical handbook which can be used in connection with in-service training programs will be published and made available to project managers, counselors, and other employment service practitioners.

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION (HumRRO)

HumRRO is an independent, non-profit corporation which, for nearly a quarter-century, has worked to improve human performance—particularly in organizational settings—through behavioral and social science research, development, consultation, and instruction. HumRRO research is conducted for major agencies of federal and state government, foundations and non-profit organizations, and private industry. HumRRO projects deal with the analysis of social policy and programs, manpower systems, organizational development, management issues, education, and human performance. HumRRO projects related to Project OLDER WORKER include a nationwide study of the employment of disabled veterans (sponsored by the Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor), an investigation of factors affecting the performance of rehabilitation agencies (sponsored by the Social Rehabilitation Service of H.E.W.), and a study of the employment problems of work-able cancer patients (sponsored by the National Cancer Institute of H.E.W.).

For further information concerning Project OLDER WORKER contact Dr. Thurlow R. Wilson, Director, Project OLDER WORKER, Human Resources Research Organization, 300 North Washington Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314, (703) 549-3611.

Appendix B

REPORT AND DISCUSSION OF NEW YORK STATE TRAINING WORKSHOP ON EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PEOPLE

Appendix B

REPORT AND DISCUSSION OF NEW YORK STATE TRAINING WORKSHOP ON EMPLOYMENT OF OLDER PEOPLE

Project OLDER WORKER staff members attended a two-day conference in Albany, New York, in March, 1977, on the employment of older persons. The conference, conducted by the Clearinghouse on Employment for the Aging for the New York Office of Aging, provided a good picture of the issues and organizations concerned with employment of older workers. A summary and discussion of the conference are presented here. (The Clearinghouse does not plan to publish proceedings of the conference. Thus, we have further reason for including our notes on the conference in this report.)

CONFERENCE OBJECTIVES AND PLAN

The objectives of the conference were stated as follows in the conference announcement: "The purpose of this training institute is to bring together agencies concerned with employment and aging, the Area Agencies on Aging, Title IX and Title X Project Sponsors, the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act [CETA] Prime Sponsors, the Age Discrimination in Employment agencies, and the voluntary agencies. The training institute will: first, acquaint the CETA Prime Sponsors, and Area Agencies on Aging with each other's jurisdictions, potentials, and problems, so as to promote their cooperative efforts in upgrading services for older job seekers; second, offer guidance in the coordination of those Title IX programs, which, for the first time this year will be administered through the State; third, provide practical information on techniques of job development and job placement; fourth, bring to participants information on an additional manpower tool, the Federal and State Age Discrimination in Employment legislation; and fifth, serve as a forum for agency, industry and government representatives to exchange viewpoints as to goals, policies and concerns."

The two-day conference had the following outline:

- Purposes and Goals
- Size of the Problem
- Age Discrimination in Employment
- Application of Age Audits in Community Programs and Industry
- New Legislation Affecting Older Worker Employment
- Manpower Programs for Older Workers
- Area Agencies on Aging and Title IX
- Job Placement and Job Development Counseling, Techniques and Models
- CETA and the New "Project Approach" to Public Service Employment

Our notes on the presentations of the various speakers and our comments on the issues they raised, follow.

PURPOSES AND GOALS

Speaker: Ms. Lou Glasse, director, New York State Office for the Aging.

Reasons for general concern with the employment needs of older workers in these times include: (a) inflation, (b) the reduction of jobs because of the recession, (c) the employers who are eliminating senior jobs, and (d) the myth of the decline of the older worker's capacity.

The importance of employment to older people is, first of all, the need for providing an adequate income. Employed elderly enjoy two times the income of those who are not employed. Then there is a sense of worth related to employment. The inability of an older person to find work affects physical and mental health, it has been found. Furthermore, the declining ratio of workers to retirees, occurring as retirement policies change, results in increasing difficulties in financing benefit programs.

The New York State Office for the Aging has been engaged in several activities related to employment. For example, it has been reviewing the mandatory retirement rules and promoting public discussion of these laws. In addition, it will administer the new funds from Title IX. In connection with a Department of Labor contract concerned with developing home care in nine rural New York counties, older workers will be trained to carry out this home care. Hopefully, programs will be developed that will support the area agencies on aging programs and that these programs will provide both employment and services to older people. However, the Title IX program for older workers is only a "drop in the bucket" in terms of employment needs in this area.

Certain continuing problems in the employment of older workers need to be emphasized. For one thing, older workers continue to find difficulties with placement officers and manpower agencies because of misunderstanding of the older workers capacities. Second, there "may be a lack of an identifiable officer dealing with older worker problems." Third, there is the need for job training for older workers. Career changes may be appropriate for them. Fourth, there can be problems from the requirement in the use of Title I, II and III funds that some employers take on workers as permanent employees. Finally, there is a need to work more effectively to coordinate various efforts dealing with older workers. "The older worker falls between the cracks." Ms. Glasse concluded "It's time to say that age has no place in determining employment."

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Philip Ross, commissioner of New York State Department of Labor.

We know that age is not a barrier in retraining and in employment. We can dismiss age as a factor. Furthermore, we know the importance of employment, because a job "determines who you are." It determines "how you are defined."

While we have a crisis in the employment of older workers, we also have a crisis in the employment of youth. There is a belief, that if we take measures to assist older workers, we are necessarily discriminating against others, such as young people.

The problem of competition is false. The basic barrier to hiring an older worker is the fact that "we have too little demand for services." An official of a building trades union reported recently that there is an unemployment rate of 85% among the members of this union. There is a general problem of unemployment among older workers.

When developing training programs for older workers, it is important to recognize that it makes little sense to apply resources to train older workers unless society can provide jobs. There must be a demand for their services.

SIZE OF THE PROBLEM

Mr. Samuel Ehrenholt, Bureau of Labor Statistics of New York, U.S. Department of Labor, was the scheduled speaker. Because of weather, he was unable to attend the conference.

AGE DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Speaker: Mr. Joe Helmer, Employment Standards Administration, New York Regional Office.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act prohibits employers, personnel agencies, and labor organizations from discriminating on the basis of age, but it protects only those workers between the ages of 40 and 65. The law covers all terms and conditions of employment, including hiring, firing, promotions, and pay. Employers are exempted from the provisions of the statute in cases where age is a bona fide occupational qualification, when the age discrimination is due to a bona fide merit system or seniority system, when provisions of a benefits plan are age-related, and in other cases when the discrimination is based on good cause. However, the Employment Standards Administration (ESA) interprets these exemptions narrowly.

The law has a two-year statute of limitations (three years in the case of willfulness), but the aggrieved employee must file a notice of intent to sue within 180 days after the alleged violation has occurred. This is to allow the ESA an opportunity to conciliate to reach a settlement, one of the options open to ESA compliance officers. As a second option, compliance officers may conduct a fact-finding investigation (this usually involves various statistical analyses and personal interviews) to determine if the company against whom the complaint was filed shows a pattern of age discrimination. All ESA investigations are kept confidential.

If an age discrimination case reaches the courts, there is, nonetheless, a good chance that it will not be heard. Some 60 to 70 percent of the age discrimination cases that get to court are thrown out due to procedural problems.

A large number of the violations the ESA has dealt with recently involved the advertisement of jobs where age was specified as a requirement. Other typical cases in which ESA becomes involved include company cutbacks where older employees are laid off first (usually with the excuse that older persons are eligible for a pension), pension and severance pay options open to younger persons but not older persons, and age discrimination in promotions. The bulk of the cases involves age discrimination in hiring and termination practices.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Arnold Mendeles, New York State Division of Human Rights.

The Division of Human Rights was established by the New York State Human Rights Law, the oldest law of its kind in the nation. The New York law states that it is considered a discriminatory act on the part of an employer or licensing agency to do anything against any person in the areas of hiring, discharge, compensation, conditions of employment, and promotions simply because of age.

When a complaint is filed, the Human Rights Division first holds a "confrontation conference" to determine if there is probable cause for continuing with official proceedings. If probable cause is established, conciliation will be attempted. Public hearings will be held in cases where conciliation is not possible. After the evidence is heard, the hearing examiner will make recommendations to the commissioner who will issue an order based on those recommendations.

The New York State Division of Human Rights has more authority in adjudicating age discrimination cases than does the ESA. The commissioner has the power to issue a cease and desist order, and he can order restitution in order to make the complainant "whole again."

Complainants reporting violations of the New York State Human Rights Law are given assistance in taking care of the administrative requirements for filing a complaint, and counsel is provided by the Commission.

Job performance evaluations are frequently used by employers as a tool for getting around the law. A negative performance evaluation can be a very effective defense for an employer because it is often difficult to refute.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Dan Knowles, personnel director of Grumman Aerospace.

Age discrimination is the most insidious form of employment discrimination because it involves discrimination against middle-aged and older workers by managers who are usually themselves middle-aged or older workers. Employers and personnel people are the worst offenders.

Most age discrimination in employment is based on myths about older workers. There should be an awareness program for employers. Such a program should include a discussion of common myths about older workers, procedures for proving that discrimination exists in a given company, and techniques that companies can use to analyze their own work force for indications of age discrimination.

To illustrate that older workers out-perform younger workers: After a recent layoff at Grumman Aerospace, where performance was the basis for determining who would be laid off, the average age of the company's employees went up.

The age distribution of the Grumman work force was compared to those of the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) on older workers. Each chart showed the distribution of employees 40 years of age and over, and the distribution of employees 45 years of age and over. In each case the Grumman work force had a higher proportion of older workers than the BLS national averages.

There are seven areas in which companies should analyze their work force if they wish to determine whether they are discriminating on the basis of age. The seven areas are: (1) work force composition, (2) hiring, (3) terminations, (4) training programs, (5) promotions and transfers, (6) recreational and social programs, and (7) retirement policies.

Questions and Answers

Q: Do other companies perform work force analyses to detect age-related biases?

A: There very well might be, but I personally don't know of any.

Q: Why are employers reluctant to hire older workers?

A: Younger persons usually make less than older workers. Also, myths about older workers account for some employers' reluctance to hire older persons. Most companies are very pragmatic; they will respond to the pressures placed on them in proportion to the degree of pressure.

Q: Do you favor doing away with mandatory retirement rules?

A: I do not favor abolishing mandatory retirement rules. If such a step were taken, companies would be "up to their eyeballs" in discrimination suits. With mandatory rules on retirement age, everyone accepts retirement at that age as a fact of life. Without them, forced retirements would have to be made on an individual basis, quite likely resulting in complaints and suits by many of those forced to retire.

(Later, a member of the audience commented that arbitrary guidelines on retirement age provide nothing more than a convenient excuse for personnel people to avoid making individual decisions concerning retirement.)

Although Grumman has a slightly higher than average mandatory retirement age, the average employee retires at 62½ years of age. Grumman recently lowered the minimum retirement age (with full benefits) to 62 because it found there was no actuarial advantage in requiring persons to wait until age 65.

Post-Conference Comments by Project OLDER WORKER Staff Members

Probably the most relevant aspects of this panel discussion for Project OLDER WORKER were the helpful insights into the reasoning of employers regarding older workers, and the forms that age discrimination commonly takes. The picture painted by the speakers was rather bleak. When someone in personnel says that the worst perpetrators of age discrimination are they themselves, we can assume that a problem exists. Also, the fact that federal and state regulatory agencies dealing with age discrimination complaints appear to be kept busy, seems to further indicate that age discrimination is a significant problem. From the comments of the three speakers we can piece together the following picture:

- Employers tend to be reluctant to hire and quick to fire older workers.

- Many older workers are discriminated against in promotions (perhaps in an effort to force them to retire).

- Some employers deny certain pension and severance pay options to older workers.

- In company cutbacks, many employers will layoff older workers first, using pension eligibility as justification.

- In responding to age discrimination complaints, many employers use negative performance evaluations as a sophisticated (and often successful) defense.

- In general, employers view hiring younger persons as good business. A younger employee is usually paid less than his older counterpart, he has a greater potential future with the company, and he is less likely to collect company pension benefits (or at least he is likely to contribute more to the pension fund than an older worker).

- Employers are not likely to welcome the abolition of mandatory retirement rules, because such a move would require employers to make forced retirement decisions on an individual basis.

APPLICATION OF AGE AUDITS IN COMMUNITY PROGRAMS AND INDUSTRY

Speaker: Mr. Michael Batten, Kirschner Associates, Inc.

We have a problem in that we have categorized age. CETA people, for example, are youth-oriented. We have to "free up" age. We have to look at age in a different way, on a comparative basis. People working with a given age group should develop a sense of proportion, to be aware of the proportion of people in a given population in that target (age) group. Program planners and managers need to have a method for analyzing age in the labor force.

Sources of national data on age distribution include the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Sources for local employment data are state labor departments, local Employment Service Office ESARS (Employment Service Automated Reporting System) data, unemployment insurance records, and several nonstandardized sources, such as state commissions on aging, area agencies on aging, regional or local planning commissions, councils of government, HUD, and the local Social Security Office.

Statistics on age distribution are valuable in planning employment services for older persons, and in preparing proposals for program funds.

Mr. Batten reviewed in detail his booklet, Age Audits in Employment: Data and Instruments, published in 1977, by Clearinghouse on Employment for the Aging.

NEW LEGISLATION AFFECTING OLDER WORKER EMPLOYMENT

Speakers: Ms. Deborah Kilmer, professional staff member, U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging; Mr. Albert Abrams, special consultant to the New York State Senate; Mr. Ron Rouse, program analyst, New York State Assembly Committee on Aging.

Ms. Kilmer mentioned legislative development on Title IX (increase in appropriation) and Title X (expired) and some bills then before Senate committees (remove 65-year ceiling on age discrimination law, remove mandatory retirement, affirmative action requirements for older workers).

Mr. Abrams and Mr. Rouse discussed mandatory retirement bills before the New York State legislature. Mr. Abrams felt that New York legislatures were unlikely to pass the laws since the laws would discourage new industries from coming to New York. Mr. Rouse argued that businessmen do not have valid objections to the proposed legislation.

Post-Conference Comments by Project OLDER WORKER Staff Members

The trend in Federal legislation concerning the elderly in employment is in the direction of job creation through the expansion of Title IX programs. The large influx of funds into Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Title VI will also create subsidized employment for the elderly as well as other unemployed groups in the population.

The relevance of this development for Project OLDER WORKER, particularly with reference to Title IX expansion, is that more organizations at every level of government and including various private, nonprofit service groups will be getting into the act of placing older people in jobs.

Each Title IX program must have as a goal the placement of 10% of its enrollees per year into unsubsidized employment. More Title IX programs mean more organizations attempting to place more older people into jobs in their communities. If Title IX funds continue to increase it is possible that projects supported with these funds will be responsible for placing more older workers than the nonprofit employment offices established to help these people. The placement of enrollees into unsubsidized employment is not the main goal of Title IX projects; thus, it is doubtful whether many program directors have the skills necessary to successfully accomplish this task.

Since the Federal Government has passed legislation against mandatory retirement, employer objections debated above would seem no longer important. Experience suggests, however, that the resistance to the legislation could be even more important as steps are taken to implement the new legislation.

MANPOWER PROGRAMS FOR OLDER WORKERS

Speaker: Mr. Charles O'Dell, former director of the U.S. Employment Service and former commissioner for the Connecticut Department on Aging.

The problems of older workers have been neglected partly because of jurisdictional disputes between Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Department of Labor, and partly because of "the notion that the purpose of Social Security was to drive older people out of the work force to create jobs for younger people. We haven't yet resolved that issue." Employment is important to older people because it is a source of additional income which they often need.

It is important to realize that the Title IX program has a "precarious relationship to certain political forces." The predecessor of the Title IX program was Operation Mainstream, which started with some Green Thumb projects operated by the Farmer's Union. Title IX has received nonpartisan support in Congress.

The Title IX projects provided a "visible sign of concerns for older people in the home district," and conservative senators and congressmen felt that it was good if people worked for what they get. Conservative senators, such as Carl Mundt, were behind the program as well as more liberal senators. Because of this broad nonpartisan support for Title IX, Congress has overridden every attempt to wipe out this program. Through the Nixon and the Ford Administrations there was an attempt to eliminate the program, but actually Congress has continued the program and increased its funds.

Now there is a fight over who will have jurisdiction over Title IX funds--now much of the funds should go to governors of states rather than Title IX national contractors. In this concern about the jurisdiction over Title IX funds, supporters of Title IX programs almost lost the increase in monies. Supporters must unite to obtain maximum funds and not be divided in their attempts to get jurisdiction. The squabbles over jurisdiction is the very thing that the opponents of the Title IX programs would like to foster. Now that the state units of aging have something to say, it is up to them to demonstrate creative use of the funds to get something done for older people. "The challenge is with you."

For the Title X projects there was only a short time, actually three weeks, to come up with creative projects for older people. It looks as though there is something like a conspiracy to show the programs up. "We can hope that in the Carter Administration things will be different regarding older worker programs."

We are guided by the concept that what older people themselves want is more important than "what we as professionals think they need."

* *

Speaker: Ms. Rita Schwartz, New York City Department for the Aging.

We had a mere six hours to develop a proposal for Title X funds for older worker jobs for New York City. Within that time period, we developed a request for 6.2 million and for some 1,400 municipal jobs. To our surprise our proposal was funded and our Area Agency on Aging was one of two such agencies to get Title X money. The other award went to Grand Rapids, Michigan (President Ford's district).

There were some 6,000 applicants for the 1,400 municipal jobs funded by Title X. The people working in these jobs have proved to each agency their value as workers: They are dependable, they set a good example, they train younger people and generally do good work.

The older people came not only for a job; they also have certain problems so "we couldn't just put them into a job." There was a need for supportive services. Of particular importance is the need to "reconstruct a self-image." People whose egos are built around working in some job for 30 years suddenly find there is no job for them anymore -- for example, a dress pattern maker for 30 years now finds he has no marketable skills.

Title X program was to be a one-year nonrefundable program. "We began a massive lobbying effort to retain the jobs." One problem in dealing with the incoming Carter Administration was to identify whom to talk to. Also, we didn't want it to appear that since this request was coming from New York City it was a bail out. The decisive factor may have been that the ending of Title X coincided with the start of Older Worker Week on March 13.

"I pointed out to one of Mr. Carter's aides that it might look very bad to fire 1,400 older workers during Older Worker Week."

Title X jobs were continued with funding through CETA Title III funds. In New York City, employees work side-by-side on jobs funded by two different sources with different regulations. As a consequence, some workers on Title IX money are paid less for doing the same job than those that are funded under the other title.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Glen Northup, director, Senior Community Service Employment Program, AARP/NART.

Jobs related to the environment and environmental regulations provide an area for employment of the elderly which not too many younger workers have entered as yet.

A year and a half ago, AARP/NART set up a project in Iowa to take an inventory of pesticide containers throughout the State, the project was funded through Title IX money, with some state funds for training and travel. It was "a great success and became nationally known." Another project dealt with environmental regulations control for water certification.

Resulting from these environmental projects is a national demonstration program for the Environmental Protection Agency. In this program, 10 projects will be funded, one for each of the Federal regions and one state in each region participating. Within each project will be 20 enrollees. The Title IX contractors will work together on the program. Projects may be concerned with noise pollution, a survey of wells and other environmental projects. It is hoped each project will be different. This is an important area in which there will be a growing interest because of concern with the environment and Federal regulations.

Through this demonstration program we can get older workers in on the ground floor of a new employment area. It can provide a "massive job market for the elderly."

Another "notable" development in Title IX projects is the use of Title IX workers who are placed in employment offices and trained as older worker specialists. This will be done in Michigan, Georgia, Texas, Florida, and Ohio. The Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, is considering a proposal to expand this project to other states. The results from using these Title IX workers as older worker specialists have been "remarkable" as judged by their placement rates. They work only with older applicants, although some offices have wanted the specialists to work with other applicants.

* * *

Speaker: Ms. Terry Strickland, Green Thumb, New York State.

Green Thumb is a rural employment and community development program sponsored by the National Farmer's Union. In New York State, it operates in 26 rural counties and employs 400 people. In addition to employment, it is concerned with on-the-job training and technical counseling.

"We hope to educate people in the realities of the older worker thereby exploding the existing myths. We totally institute and administer our own programs in New York State."

The New York office of Green Thumb administers the programs throughout the state, and reports to the National Office. This state-controlled program means that "we can make adjustments without going through a lot of red tape." Employees work in crews or as single placements. Crews, organized as a unit with a foreperson and a safety person, may work on community improvement projects or priority projects to help senior citizens, such as home winterization and home repair. Single placements can be clerical workers, library aides, nutrition aides, etc.

* * *

Speaker: Ms. Ellie Atlee, Senior Community Service Project, the National Council on the Aging.

The National Council on the Aging is working with community agencies in seven counties in New York State through their Senior Community Service Program. There are some 303 job slots in New York. This is a training and work experience program; it is not "scut work." Five area agencies on aging in New York act as sponsors, working through the State Office on Aging to decide where the projects should be located.

"The challenge of Title IX is to work with people who have come to the end of their life thinking they have nothing. You know they have much. You have to help them surface it."

With older housewives who are seeking work we have to review, not their job history or job experience, but their work experience.

The new thrust of the National Council on Aging is an emphasis on enrollee job development in each project.

We welcome the State Office on Aging and the Area Offices on Aging that will become involved in Senior Community Service Programs through the new Title IX funds.

Questions and Answers on Manpower Programs for Older Workers

Q: When will the national contractors stop competing so that we can negotiate with everybody?

A: When additional money comes for the state, the national contractors go to the State Office on Aging, and the jobs are located pending on the advice of the State Office on Aging. The State Office on Aging acts as a negotiator. There may be several regions competing for a program that is in demand, and a choice has to be made as to which region will get the new program.

Q: What Title IX money will go to New York State and what will be done with it?

A: Some 1½ million dollars will go to the State of New York for the area agencies on aging. Title IX funding will be discussed with the area agency directors at a later meeting.

Q: What about the transition to unsubsidized employment?

A: There is no required time limit or length of time in community service jobs. There is a required 10% goal for unsubsidized placements. The National Council on Aging Community Service Program places about 34% in unsubsidized employment. However, those in unsubsidized employment may be placed into jobs funded by other Federal money. A Title IX enrollee soon can become attached to the Title IX job and not want to leave -- he is afraid of change. In the program managed by AARP/NART, if a worker turns down two outside offers for an unsubsidized job he is fired from the community service job.

(Secretary of Labor, Ray Marshall had spoken in San Antonio to the Green Thumb meeting, an audience member reported. The Secretary stressed the importance of employment for older people. It is gratifying that "human values are taken seriously by the Administration," the conferee commented.)

AREA AGENCIES ON AGING AND TITLE IX

Speaker: Mr. Michael Di Paolo, New York State Office of Aging.

More than one million dollars in additional funds have been allocated to New York State in Title IX funds which are to be administered through the State Office on Aging. The State's 54 area agencies on aging will be involved. The funds providing for some 250 jobs will be allocated to all counties within the state, on the basis of the number of elderly poor aged 65 or more. "For political reasons" each county would be allowed a minimum of three jobs.

Several questions are to be asked: Whose payroll will the people be on? Is the figure of $4,000 per job correct? What kinds of jobs will be established?

The fact that the State governors are getting money is "a sore issue" with the Title IX national contractors.

The requirements for senior community service jobs were reviewed, including the "local share" requirement of 10% of the grant, which can be contributed "in kind." If workers are placed with a non-Federal agency the time to supervise the workers would count toward the local share. Other requirements include (1) cooperation with other manpower agencies, (2) listing the job with the State Employment Security Office, (3) ability of the applicant physically and mentally to perform the work, and (4) expenditure of 70% of the funds for wages. (The rest of the money may be used for training and supportive services.)

Post-Conference Comments by Project OLDER WORKER Staff Members

The political forces supporting Title IX are strong. Indications are that Title IX funds will expand in the next few years, with increases in funds to both the Title IX national contractors and to states. Area agencies on aging will become much more involved in employment.

Identifying new areas of employment for the elderly is an important one, as Mr. Northup of the AARP/NART pointed out.

The role of the State Office on Aging is described as one of negotiating for location of projects and deciding where the programs will go. This role contrasts sharply with the impression we have gained in talking to the staffs of Office on Aging in other states about their involvement in community service employment programs. Could it be that the role of the Office on Aging is entirely different in New York State from that in certain other states?

The dividing of Title IX jobs between the various counties in New York, which resulted in some counties getting as few as three community service jobs, makes us wonder how efficiently this program will be managed. It will be very important to learn the experience of the area agencies on aging as they endeavor to comply with these regulations and set up these programs.

JOB PLACEMENT AND JOB DEVELOPMENT COUNSELING, TECHNIQUES AND MODELS

Speaker: Ms. Eleanor Tailsman, Senior Community Service Project (SCSP) of the Cooperative Extension Association, Nassau County.

Title IX enrollees in a program administered through Cornell University, a state institution, had to be terminated because they had passed the New York State mandatory retirement age. The enrollees were considered to be state employees. In New York, no person may be hired after the age of 70, and no individual may be retained after the age of 78 without proof that his services are unique. After age 78, no individual may be retained for any reason by the State. This incident should be a warning to other Title IX administrators in New York if they are considering working through state agencies.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Jack Blanchfield, executive director, Senior Personnel Employment Committee, Inc., White Plains, New York.

The Senior Personnel Employment Committee (SPEC) is a private, nonprofit employment office serving people over age 60 in Westchester County, a predominately white, middle and upper middle class county, a "bedroom suburb" of New York City. This service is one of the most successful nonprofit employment offices for the older worker. SPEC places between 12,000 and 15,000 applicants each year, whose combined salaries contribute 3 to 4 million dollars to the economy.

About two out of every three applicants are placed, 60 percent of whom are in the commercial and industrial field, and the remaining 40 percent are "paid neighbors" or "home services." Most jobs are part-time and temporary as their applicants request them to be. Most are on Social Security with an income ceiling.

The only function of SPEC is to get jobs for its applicants. Staff members provide counseling on employment only. The success of SPEC is due to the good product, the good staff of volunteers, and superior placement techniques.

To ensure success, such organizations must have the support of the entire community. Representatives of IBM, Reader's Digest, and social service agencies serve on the Board of SPEC. The government cannot be the force that motivates businesses to hire the elderly. Instead, offices like SPEC must show that hiring the elderly is good business.

Simplicity of procedures, persistence, and "the marketing approach" emphasize the efficiency of SPEC. By offering only one service for no fee, SPEC's operating procedures are simple. Overhead is reduced by securing free office space, equipment, and printing services from other businesses in the community.

SPEC's "marketing approach" gives the elderly job seeker the proper image. The same approach is used to obtain job listings. Ex-corporate executives knock on doors on behalf of SPEC, publicizing the services and soliciting listings. SPEC gets free printed "blurbs" inserted in local electric bills, for instance, and it saturates the community with brochures. The organization secures public service announcements on TV and takes advantage of seasonal demands for temporary help -- for example, from tax firms that need extra help during the winter.

A successful subsidiary of SPEC is "Senior Temps," which is run like a commercial temporary manpower office. Large industries in the county, such as IBM, which seldom hire a new employee over 60 (companies generally retire their own employees at that age) will employ the services of Senior Temps. The older worker is officially an employee of Senior Temps and is never put on the payroll of the industry that hires him as a temporary employee. Senior Temps charges a 20% markup, rather than the 50% markup that most "temporary" agencies charge. This is an example of proving to business that hiring the elderly is profitable.

* * *

Speaker: Ms. Effie Heath, founder of GROW (Gaining Resources for Older Workers), Binghamton, New York.

The story of GROW is interesting for its grass roots beginnings and its evolution into the unofficial older worker unit of the State Employment Service in Binghamton. Several years ago, at my request, a New York State Employment Service representative and a representative from the Broome County Action for Older Persons (A United Way agency) spoke at my church to generate enthusiasm for a local employment agency for older persons. The State Employment Service provided office space, and 10 volunteers from the church, mostly housewives, gave their time to establish GROW.

Initially, the budget was only $500 per year. However, GROW received support from the community in the form of free advertising, printing, etc. Gradually, the original volunteers were replaced with older workers, and finally with 10 volunteers from RSVP (Retired Senior Volunteer Program).

About a year ago, GROW received CETA funds from the Broome County Action for Older Persons to pay for a full-time director. A paid job developer solicits openings from community businesses.

Although GROW is not an official arm of the New York State Employment Service, it, in effect, serves as the older worker unit for the local SES Office. GROW has access to the Employment Service job bank. In addition, the Employment Service informs GROW of jobs suitable for older applicants before listing them in the job bank. The job bank records that GROW uses have been purged of the employer's name. When a GROW applicant is matched to a suitable job bank listing, the applicant is referred to the SES office for interview and referral. Also, older applicants that apply to the SES are referred first to GROW as a matter of course.

GROW also provides jobs for older workers through the local Title IX Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). The State Employment Service cooperates here by performing the eligibility checks for the Title IX applicants.

Like SPEC in White Plains, GROW provides only job listing and job referral services. Other than age, GROW has no eligibility requirements for its applicants. It is up to the applicant and the potential employer to negotiate pay rates and establish references.

GROW, perhaps, could serve as a model for the coordination of a nonprofit employment office with other community and state and Federal agencies whose interest is also in helping the older job seeker. Partially funded through CETA, the GROW staff is also augmented by older persons in the RSVP Action Program. Besides providing office space, the local State Employment Office shares its job listing and its applicants. Finally, GROW has ties with the local Title IX SCESP program.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Stockman Barner, Forty Plus Club of New York, Inc.

"We discriminate."

Like other Forty Pluses, the New York Forty Plus has strict eligibility requirements. Applicants' previous income must have exceeded $18,500 from a managerial, administrative, or professional job. Even more exclusive than than other Forty Plus clubs, the New York club accepts only one out of eight or 10 applications. Applicants must provide eight references which are thoroughly checked by the Forty Plus screening committee. On this basis, the few are chosen to bear the Forty Plus membership in public. Applicants who are over 65 are informed that they probably cannot be placed, since Forty Plus deals mostly with large corporations that have their own mandatory retirement rules.

Even though the New York Forty Plus attempts to maintain the atmosphere of an exclusive club, the unemployed executive comes to Forty Plus like a "beaten dog." The organization is somewhat of a self-help group, like Alcoholics Anonymous. Those who are placed in jobs and "don't work out" come back to Forty Plus as "retreads."

The club places about five members per week in executive positions. The average former salary of members is between $25,000-$30,000. Their average age is 50.5 years and the duration of unemployment, between 5 and 11 months.

Like other Forty Pluses, the New York organization is run by committees. A marketing committee solicits jobs from major corporations; a placement committee matches the requirements of the job to the "achievement resumes" of the members. The individual applicant is not permitted to see the list of jobs solicited by the marketing committee; he must accept the committee's suggestions for appropriate matches.

In an effort to maintain its prestige, Forty Plus runs an office with a "good address" and high overhead. As a result, applicants are charged a 2% placement fee based on their first year's salary.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Sven Hammar, director, Chautauqua Office for the Aging, A Small-Town Rural Model.

Our efforts to find employment for the elderly can be likened more to a Rube Goldberg invention than to a rural model. In order to understand the employment problems of the area's older citizens, it was first necessary to appreciate the economics of a rural area. Poverty in a rural area is widespread, but "it looks different." Forty percent of the population 60 years and over live at or below the poverty level.

Our area has a weak industrial base, the main industry being low-paying resorts which are transitory, unstable, and seasonal. About a third of the area's residents have jobs in the nearest big cities, thus creating a transportation problem because there is no mass transit. In contrast to more populated areas, there is a shortage of local institutions and resources. There are a few county-wide institutions and no private employment agencies.

The local AAA (Area Agency on Aging) director must be aggressive and take a broad view of his responsibilities. He should understand the economics of his community and help shape its economic development.

The employment "service" of the Chautauqua Office began informally as people casually mentioned their need for work. Gradually, the operation was refined as the number of requests grew. A small Title IX program of 18 slots was obtained. The county also received some Green Thumb jobs, which we liked, because the county does not have the responsibility for administering them. With CETA funds for training programs, some elderly citizens were trained in home help and personal care and then placed in unsubsidized jobs in the community.

We can offer the following advice for AAA seeking to establish an employment service function:

(1) Begin with your own agency. Good works start at home -- that is, hire the elderly yourself.

(2) Go where the jobs are. There are more jobs in government than in private industry in rural areas. (Like other speakers at the conference, Mr. Hammar pointed out that CETA seems reluctant to hire older workers. Nationally, only 3.5% of CETA enrollees are 55 years and over.)

(3) Evaluate yourself; be honest. (Mr. Hammar said that he was forced to realize that he was not successful in placing Title IX enrollees into unsubsidized employment in the private sector. As an alternative, he has tried placing them in the CETA Title VII jobs.)

(4) Concentrate on changing attitudes. Make noise. Have an Employ The Older Worker Week. Use the media and schools to educate people on what the older worker can do.

Anyone hoping to establish an employment service for the elderly in a rural area had better understand the prevailing economic realities and adjust their tactics accordingly. With few community resources to draw upon, the AAA director must display more aggression and initiative than his urban counterpart.

Post Conference Comments by Project OLDER WORKER Staff Members

The heterogeneity of the four approaches to serving older job seekers makes it clear that there should be no single formula labeled as the "best way" to run an employment office for the elderly. Older job seekers cannot be treated as a homogeneous group any more than the younger segment of the population can. Even among job seekers 55 and older there can be generation gaps. If the over-40 unemployed are included, this fact is even more marked. The Forty Plus executive who is "between positions" has little in common with the retired farm worker in upstate New York. While the former may have to cut back on his standard of living, he is in little danger of starvation or isolation in an unheated home. This does not mean that the unemployed professional does not need help in finding work. It does mean that the techniques for placing him/her successfully may not be at all suitable for other older job seekers in different socio-economic categories or geographical areas.

Even among a relatively homogeneous group such as the Forty Plus membership, the formula approach is not always successful. Despite Mr. Barner's implication that the New York Forty Plus is a haven for failures, this organization can claim an enviable placement rate of about five members per week in high quality jobs. But what works in New York does not seem to be so successful in Washington, D.C. Apparently such shared characteristics as middle-age and previous professional or managerial experience are not sufficient to dictate a common approach to looking for work. Many Washington Forty Plus members receive pensions from either the Civil Service or the military. Because they are less motivated to help themselves, they lack an ingredient crucial to the effectiveness of the Forty Plus methods.

While the methods for placing older job seekers presented by the four speakers differed vastly, we couldn't help but be impressed with the energy, personality, enthusiasm, dedication, etc., that most of the speakers brought to their work. Unfortunately, our survey of nonprofit employment offices cannot reflect the extent to which the success of an office is dependent on the vigor and ideas of its director and staff. For example, it is hard to imagine the White Plains Senior Employment Committee succeeding without the efforts of Mr. Blanchfield. In the same way, Mr. Hammar's local Area Agency on Aging would not serve older job seekers at all were it not for his "broad view of his responsibilities" and his "aggressive" approach. That unquantifiable quality of enthusiasm and belief in the value of older workers seems to be the force behind each of the successful nonprofit employment offices.

Mr. Blanchfield stressed that an employment office like his cannot succeed without the cooperation of many of the power sources in his community, particularly private enterprise. Very few people trying to place older job seekers into unsubsidized employment would probably argue with this statement. But the difference is that Mr. Blanchfield is able to get this support, and we are sure he gets it through projection of his convictions that hiring the elderly is good for the employer as well as the employee.

Both SPEC and GROW are single-minded in their approach to serving the older job seeker. They offer no services other than job referral and placements. They accept all kinds of applicants and all kinds of listings. The emphasis is on making a good match rather than on teaching the applicants how to go about making the match themselves.

In Mr. Blanchfield's area, where there is a lot of private industry and big business, community support means securing the cooperation of corporations such as IBM, Reader's Digest, and so on. But in the case of GROW, located in Binghamton, community support means recruiting the participation of local and county service organizations that are designed to help the elderly. With less monetary wealth in the community, GROW enlisted backing of another kind -- the local United Way, the local area Office on Aging, the local State Employment Service, and the local Action Program. In Mr. Hammar's case, where there is little private industry and few county institutions, he looked for support from the Federal government. The jobs he provides are mostly supported through CETA funds and Green Thumb.

COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT AND NEW "PROJECT APPROACH" TO PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT

Speaker: Mr. Geof Trego, National Association of Counties.

The project approach to public service employment can be described as an attempt by the government to target funds to those most in need, and to improve the type of positions created through CETA programs. The Title VI appropriation is 6.6 billion dollars to be spent in FY 77 and 78. By the end of FY 78 those funds should have provided public service employment to about 725,000 people, which is only a small portion of those unemployed.

The language of the appropriations bill defines a project as "a definable task or a group of tasks which: (1) will be completed within a definable time period not exceeding one year, (2) will have a public service objective, (3) will result in a specific product or accomplishment, and (4) would otherwise not be done with the project and activity's applicant's existing funds." However, it gives no explicit information on what qualifies as a project and what doesn't.

To qualify for a public service job under Title VI, an applicant must be from a low income family (70% of the lower living standard, or $7,030 for a family of four in the State of New York), and either on A.F.D.C. or on unemployment insurance for 15 weeks or longer, or ineligible for unemployment insurance for 15 weeks or longer, or must have exhausted unemployment insurance benefits. The major problem with these eligibility requirements is that they automatically eliminate those who have not gone through the unemployment insurance system. This has a serious impact on employing senior citizens in the program, because many of them have never been through the U.I. system.

* * *

Speaker: Ms. Estell Epperly, Regional Manpower Coordination Unit of HEW.

Program planners for Title VI funds and operators have to approach prime sponsors in the same way to get specific jobs funded. However, Title VI proposals should most definitely be developed in terms of anticipated project accomplishments. According to the appropriations bill the money has to go to meet community service needs.

Those who plan to submit proposals for Title VI funds should try to develop positions that will have a long term effect -- for example, training job developers. The money can also be used to support program activities funded under other titles, but there are a few restrictions. Senior centers, foster grandparents programs, and other similar programs are also eligible for Title VI funding.

Different agencies with similar ideas for Title VI projects should go in together on a proposal. Those planning Title VI projects should talk to the prime sponsor first to assess his interests and inclinations.

* * *

Speaker: Mr. Charles Back, CETA director for Duchess County, New York.

CETA was "written in the political wind and is now being regulated by suffocation -- it is being drowned in paper." Shifting requirements and standards get in the way of the performance of the primary CETA objective: providing employment for low income families.

CETA Title VI is "poorly planned and ill conceived." Transition to unsubsidized jobs has gone out the window, as, to a large degree, has training. The Title VI expansion has "almost drowned the planning for Title I."

Many CETA directors were politically appointed and were not experienced in manpower planning and analysis. Some could not even read a labor analysis.

Constantly changing target groups are imposed from above on CETA directors. Because of this, most CETA directors will probably avoid running too many programs for seniors.

Anyone has the right to review his prime sponsors' program plans to determine what segments of the population the sponsor is serving with CETA programs. There are three CETA reports that can provide useful information for program planners: (1) the quarterly characteristic report, (2) the budget information summary, and (3) the program planning summary.

* * *

Speaker: Ms. Carolyn Rush, director of CETA programs in Oswego County, New York.

Although I disagree with many of Mr. Back's comments (above), I do agree that CETA directors must sometimes work against insurmountable odds as far as the way CETA legislation is written and the way it's passed down to them. There is a short fuse on Title VI funding, and the new eligibility requirements mean that eligibility must be reestablished for those persons already classified.

As of April (1977), (conference date being March 24) Oswego County has to have located 100 people to place in Title VI slots. Although this would not normally pose a problem since there are more than 2,000 names in our files, the new eligibility requirements mean that eligibility for each of those persons has to be reestablished.

Title I is actually a much better avenue for approaching prime sponsors for a permanent employment program. The fact that Title VI jobs are part of of a "project" with a maximum 12-month duration causes many problems.

Nonprofit agencies that deal with senior citizens should submit proposals for Title VI funds as soon as possible. The main things CETA sponsors will be looking for in Title VI proposals are as follows: (1) Is it a project? Does it meet the Federal Guidelines? (2) Does it provide a community service? (3) Are there unemployed people in the prime sponsor's jurisdiction who can fill the type of jobs called for?

Although many of the elderly cannot receive direct benefit from Title VI funding since they do not meet the eligibility requirements, we will try to develop programs through Title VI that provide services for the elderly. That way many of the elderly will at least receive indirect benefit from the Title VI program.

Post-Conference Comments by Project OLDER WORKER Staff Members

This session raises the question of the extent to which jobs under CETA could be used to benefit older workers -- either by employing them or by providing needed services to them.

It was not clear to us why this information on CETA proposals was given to a meeting attended primarily by representatives of area agencies on aging. Were area agencies being invited to submit proposals to prime sponsors? Should they somehow become involved with proposals submitted to prime sponsors by other agencies?

Looking over all the sessions we noted that the State Employment Service had little representation in this conference. The director of the SESA (Mr. Ross) made some general remarks about employment of older people, and at another session the use of volunteers within a State Employment Office was described (GROW). However, except for occasional complaints on the lack of services older workers receive from the State Employment Service, the conference paid little attention to the State Employment Service. Since more older job applicants utilize this service than all other manpower programs it would seem important to give more attention to the problems and the potential of the public employment offices for older workers.

Appendix C

TABULATIONS OF JOB SEEKER SURVEY RESPONSES BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE

A copy of the Job Seeker Survey
will be found in Appendix A, pp. 156-159.

Table C-1

MOST RECENT JOB (OCCUPATIONAL GROUP) BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

COUNT COL PCT	SES 1.	NON-PROFIT 2.	40+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
1. PROF-TECH	70 11.7	34 10.4	23 30.3	127 12.7
2. MANAGER-ADMIN	77 12.9	35 10.7	49 64.5	161 16.1
3. SALES	52 8.7	34 10.4	2 2.6	88 8.8
4. CLERICAL	145 24.2	98 29.9	1 1.3	244 24.3
5. CRAFTS	83 13.9	36 11.0	1 1.3	120 12.0
6. OPERATIVE	37 6.2	8 2.4	0 0.0	45 4.5
7. TRANSP OPERATOR	14 2.3	9 2.7	0 0.0	23 2.3
8. LABORER EX FARM	40 6.7	8 2.4	0 0.0	48 4.8
9. SERVICE	65 10.9	43 13.1	0 0.0	108 10.8
10. HOUSEHOLD WORKER	12 2.0	20 6.1	0 0.0	32 3.2
11. FARMERS	3 0.5	2 0.6	0 0.0	5 0.5
13. UNCODABLE	1 0.2	1 0.3	0 0.0	2 0.2
COLUMN TOTAL	599 59.7	328 32.7	76 7.6	1003 100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 49

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-2

TYPE OF EMPLOYER IN MOST RECENT JOB BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
           COUNT  I
          COL PCT ISES        NON-       40+          ROW
                  I           PROFIT                 TOTAL
                  I       1.I       2.I       3.I
         ---------I---------I---------I---------I
               1. I   489   I   230   I    57   I    776
  PRIVATE CO      I  81.6   I  71.7   I  75.0   I   77.9
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               2. I    93   I    64   I    13   I    170
  GOVERNMENT      I  15.5   I  19.9   I  17.1   I   17.1
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               3. I    13   I    24   I     6   I     43
  SELF-EMPLOYED   I   2.2   I   7.5   I   7.9   I    4.3
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               4. I     4   I     3   I     0   I      7
  FAMILY BUSINESS I   0.7   I   0.9   I   0.0   I    0.7
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
           COLUMN     599       321        76        996
            TOTAL    60.1      32.2       7.6      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        56
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-3

HOURS WORKED PER WEEK IN MOST RECENT JOB BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
           COUNT  I
         COL PCT  ISES       NON-      40+         ROW
                  I          PROFIT                TOTAL
                  I      1.I      2.I      3.I
         ---------I--------I--------I--------I
                2.  I     2  I     1  I     0  I     3
5 TO 9 HRS          I   0.3  I   0.3  I   0.0  I   0.3
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                3.  I     6  I     4  I     0  I    10
10 TO 14 HRS        I   1.0  I   1.2  I   0.0  I   1.0
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                4.  I     3  I     5  I     0  I     8
15 TO 19 HRS        I   0.5  I   1.6  I   0.0  I   0.8
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                5.  I    36  I    28  I     0  I    64
20 TO 24 HRS        I   6.0  I   8.7  I   0.0  I   6.4
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                6.  I    10  I     7  I     0  I    17
25 TO 29 HRS        I   1.7  I   2.2  I   0.0  I   1.7
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                7.  I    22  I    18  I     0  I    40
30 TO 34 HRS        I   3.7  I   5.6  I   0.0  I   4.0
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                8.  I   393  I   189  I    43  I   625
35 TO 40 HRS        I  65.3  I  58.9  I  56.6  I  62.6
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
                9.  I   130  I    69  I    33  I   232
OVER 40 HRS         I  21.6  I  21.5  I  43.4  I  23.2
                 -I--------I--------I--------I
            COLUMN       602      321       76       999
             TOTAL      60.3     32.1      7.6     100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       53
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-4

ANNUAL EARNINGS IN MOST RECENT JOB BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
            COUNT  I
          COL PCT  ISES         NON-         40+               ROW
                   I            PROFIT                         TOTAL
                   I        1.I        2.I        3.I
         ----------I----------I----------I----------I
                1. I      9   I      9   I      0   I          18
UNDER $2000        I    1.5   I    2.9   I    0.0   I         1.8
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                2. I     59   I     58   I      0   I         117
$2000 TO $3999     I    9.8   I   18.4   I    0.0   I        11.8
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                3. I     91   I     53   I      1   I         145
$4000 TO $5999     I   15.1   I   16.8   I    1.4   I        14.6
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                4. I     93   I     50   I      1   I         144
$6000 TO $7999     I   15.4   I   15.9   I    1.4   I        14.5
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                5. I     82   I     29   I      0   I         111
$8000 TO $9999     I   13.6   I    9.2   I    0.0   I        11.2
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                6. I    127   I     63   I      5   I         195
$10000 TO $14999   I   21.1   I   20.0   I    6.8   I        19.7
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                7. I     85   I     34   I     17   I         136
$15000 TO $19999   I   14.1   I   10.8   I   23.0   I        13.7
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                8. I     32   I     10   I     19   I          61
$20000 TO $24999   I    5.3   I    3.2   I   25.7   I         6.2
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
                9. I     19   I      8   I     23   I          50
$25000 TO $34999   I    3.2   I    2.5   I   31.1   I         5.0
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
               10. I      5   I      1   I      8   I          14
$35000 AND OVER    I    0.8   I    0.3   I   10.8   I         1.4
                  -I----------I----------I----------I
           COLUMN       602        315         74             991
            TOTAL      60.7       31.8        7.5           100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        61
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-5

LABOR FORCE STATUS AT TIME OF SURVEY BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
             COUNT  I
            COL PCT ISES        NON-       40+            ROW
                    I           PROFIT                   TOTAL
                    I        1.I        2.I        3.I
           ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                 1. I    53   I    66   I     7   I     126
    EMPLOYED        I   8.6   I  19.6   I   8.6   I    12.2
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                 2. I   525   I   249   I    73   I     847
    UNEMPLOYED      I  85.2   I  74.1   I  90.1   I    82.0
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                 3. I    38   I    21   I     1   I      60
    OUT OF LABOR FOR I   6.2   I   6.3   I   1.2   I     5.8
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
             COLUMN     616       336        81       1033
              TOTAL    59.6      32.5       7.8      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       19
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-6

DURATION OF UNEMPLOYMENT BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
            COUNT  I
          COL PCT  ISES        NON-       40+           ROW
                   I           PROFIT                   TOTAL
                   I       1.I       2.I       3.I
         ----------I---------I---------I---------I
                0. I    88   I    53   I     6   I     147
LESS THAN 1 MO     I  20.9   I  29.4   I   9.0   I    22.0
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
                1. I    76   I    24   I     5   I     105
1 OR 2 MO          I  18.0   I  13.3   I   7.5   I    15.7
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
                2. I    95   I    31   I    19   I     145
3 TO 6 MO          I  22.5   I  17.2   I  28.4   I    21.7
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
                3. I    99   I    24   I    20   I     143
7 TO 12 MO         I  23.5   I  13.3   I  29.9   I    21.4
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
                4. I    41   I    23   I    12   I      76
1  TO 2 YRS        I   9.7   I  12.8   I  17.9   I    11.4
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
                5. I    23   I    25   I     5   I      53
OVER 2 YEARS       I   5.5   I  13.9   I   7.5   I     7.9
                  -I---------I---------I---------I
           COLUMN      422       180        67         669
            TOTAL     63.1      26.9      10.0       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      383
```

---

*Unemployed respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older. Unemployed means out of work, looking for work, and able to accept a job.

Table C-7

REASON FOR LEAVING MOST RECENT JOB BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
           COUNT  I
         COL PCT  ISES        NON-       40+          ROW
                  I           PROFIT                  TOTAL
                  I       1.I       2.I       3.I
        ----------I---------I---------I---------I
               1. I    46   I    51   I     7   I     104
 RETIRED-CHOICE   I   8.3   I  18.8   I   9.5   I    11.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               2. I   268   I    63   I    39   I     370
 LAID OFF         I  48.1   I  23.2   I  52.7   I    41.0
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               3. I     8   I     8   I     7   I      23
 LOST BUSINESS    I   1.4   I   3.0   I   9.5   I     2.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               4. I    30   I    19   I     3   I      52
 TEMP JOB ENDED   I   5.4   I   7.0   I   4.1   I     5.8
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               5. I    83   I    36   I    10   I     129
 RETIRED-FORCE    I  14.9   I  13.3   I  13.5   I    14.3
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               6. I    38   I    34   I     0   I      72
 ILLNESS          I   6.8   I  12.5   I   0.0   I     8.0
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               7. I    20   I    19   I     1   I      40
 FIND BETTER JOB  I   3.6   I   7.0   I   1.4   I     4.4
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               8. I    64   I    41   I     7   I     112
 OTHER            I  11.5   I  15.1   I   9.5   I    12.4
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
          COLUMN      557       271        74         902
           TOTAL     61.8      30.0       8.2       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      150
```

*Respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were not working and who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-8

REASON FOR SEEKING WORK BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
         COUNT  I
        COL PCT ISES       NON-       40+          ROW
                I          PROFIT                 TOTAL
                I       1.I       2.I       3.I
        --------I---------I---------I---------I
              1.  I    66   I    59   I    11   I    136
BORED             I   11.0  I   17.5  I   13.6  I   13.3
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              2.  I   426   I   209   I    58   I    693
NEEDED MONEY      I   70.9  I   62.0  I   71.6  I   68.0
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              3.  I    22   I    24   I     1   I     47
HEALTH IMPROVED   I    3.7  I    7.1  I    1.2  I    4.6
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              4.  I    28   I    22   I     2   I     52
FIND BETTER JOB   I    4.7  I    6.5  I    2.5  I    5.1
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              5.  I     2   I     2   I     0   I      4
FIND SECOND JOB   I    0.3  I    0.6  I    0.0  I    0.4
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              6.  I    28   I    10   I     4   I     42
POST RETIRMT JOB  I    4.7  I    3.0  I    4.9  I    4.1
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              7.  I    29   I    11   I     5   I     45
OTHER             I    4.8  I    3.3  I    6.2  I    4.4
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
         COLUMN       601       337        81        1019
          TOTAL       59.0      33.1       7.9      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       33
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-9

ABILITY TO ACCEPT WORK AT TIME OF SURVEY BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
          COUNT  I
        COL PCT  ISES          NON-          40+          ROW
                 I             PROFIT                     TOTAL
                 I        1.I        2.I        3.I
        ---------I---------I---------I---------I
              1.  I   562   I   289   I    74   I    925
COULD TAKE JOB   I   91.2  I   85.0  I   91.4  I   89.2
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              2.  I    23   I    35   I     6   I     64
ALREADY HAVE JOB I    3.7  I   10.3  I    7.4  I    6.2
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              3.  I    13   I     6   I     0   I     19
SICK THIS WEEK   I    2.1  I    1.8  I    0.0  I    1.8
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              4.  I     1   I     2   I     0   I      3
IN SCHOOL        I    0.2  I    0.6  I    0.0  I    0.3
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              5.  I    17   I     8   I     1   I     26
OTHER            I    2.8  I    2.4  I    1.2  I    2.5
                -I---------I---------I---------I
         COLUMN       616       340        81       1037
          TOTAL      59.4      32.8       7.8      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       15
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-10

THOUGHT EMPLOYERS DID NOT HIRE DUE TO AGE BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
         COUNT   I
        COL PCT  ISES        NON-       40+          ROW
                 I           PROFIT                  TOTAL
                 I       1.I       2.I       3.I
        ---------I---------I---------I---------I
              1. I   163   I    95   I     9   I     267
NO               I  27.1   I  27.9   I  11.1   I    26.1
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              2. I   372   I   168   I    69   I     609
YES              I  61.9   I  49.4   I  85.2   I    59.6
                -I---------I---------I---------I
              3. I    66   I    77   I     3   I     146
NONE CONTACTED   I  11.0   I  22.6   I   3.7   I    14.3
                -I---------I---------I---------I
         COLUMN      601       340        81        1022
          TOTAL     58.8      33.3       7.9       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       30
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-11

TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT HELP WANTED MOST BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
               COUNT   I
               COL PCT ISFS       NON-      40+            ROW
                       I          PROFIT                   TOTAL
                       I       1.I       2.I       3.I
              ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                    1. I   289   I   182   I    39   I    510
  CONTACTG EMPLYER     I  56.7   I  65.7   I  50.6   I   59.0
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    2. I    11   I     3   I     0   I     14
  JOB TRAING INFO      I   2.2   I   1.1   I   0.0   I    1.6
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    3. I     0   I     2   I     0   I      2
  JOBS OUT OF TOWN     I   0.0   I   0.7   I   0.0   I    0.2
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    4. I    25   I     6   I     0   I     31
  DECIDG TYPE JOB      I   4.9   I   2.2   I   0.0   I    3.6
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    5. I     1   I     0   I     1   I      2
  INTERVIEW ADVICE     I   0.2   I   0.0   I   1.3   I    0.2
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    6. I     5   I     0   I     2   I      7
  RESUME TIPS          I   1.0   I   0.0   I   2.6   I    0.8
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    7. I    79   I    30   I    18   I    127
  JOB OPENING LIST     I  15.5   I  10.8   I  23.4   I   14.7
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    8. I     3   I     6   I     0   I      9
  COPE W DISCOURMT     I   0.6   I   2.2   I   0.0   I    1.0
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                    9. I    30   I    22   I     1   I     53
  PERSONAL PROBS       I   5.9   I   7.9   I   1.3   I    6.1
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                   10. I     2   I     1   I     3   I      6
  SELLING SELF         I   0.4   I   0.4   I   3.9   I    0.7
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                   11. I    12   I     8   I     8   I     28
  FINDG JOB LEADS      I   2.4   I   2.9   I  10.4   I    3.2
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                   12. I    31   I    13   I     3   I     47
  AGE DISCRIMINATN     I   6.1   I   4.7   I   3.9   I    5.4
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
                   13. I    22   I     4   I     2   I     28
  OTHER                I   4.3   I   1.4   I   2.6   I    3.2
                      -I---------I---------I---------I
               COLUMN      510       277        77        864
                TOTAL     59.0      32.1       8.9      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       188
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-12

SATISFACTION WITH EMPLOYMENT HELP RECEIVED BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
                 COUNT  I
               COL PCT  ISES       NON-      40+          ROW
                        I          PROFIT                 TOTAL
                        I       1.I       2.I       3.I
               ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                     1. I   260   I   140   I    13   I    413
  CANT SAY YET          I  43.8   I  42.0   I  17.1   I   41.2
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     2. I   197   I   136   I    24   I    357
  VERY SATISFIED        I  33.2   I  40.8   I  31.6   I   35.6
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     3. I    91   I    34   I    31   I    156
  SOMEWT SATISFIED      I  15.3   I  10.2   I  40.8   I   15.6
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     4. I    27   I    10   I     6   I     43
  UNSATISFIED           I   4.6   I   3.0   I   7.9   I    4.3
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     5. I    18   I    13   I     2   I     33
  VERY UNSATISFIED      I   3.0   I   3.9   I   2.6   I    3.3
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                COLUMN      593       333        76       1002
                 TOTAL     59.2      33.2       7.6      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        50
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-13

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME IN 1976 BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

COUNT COL PCT	SES 1.	NON-PROFIT 2.	40+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
1. UNDER $2000	53 9.0	28 8.3	5 6.2	86 8.5
2. $2000 TO $3999	82 13.9	73 21.6	1 1.2	156 15.4
3. $4000 TO $5999	95 16.1	60 17.8	3 3.7	158 15.6
4. $6000 TO $7999	63 10.7	40 11.8	3 3.7	106 10.5
5. $8000 TO $9999	58 9.8	46 13.6	3 3.7	107 10.6
6. $10000 TO $14999	110 18.6	46 13.6	14 17.3	170 16.8
7. $15000 TO $19999	62 10.5	24 7.1	10 12.3	96 9.5
8. $20000 TO $24999	30 5.1	15 4.4	12 14.8	57 5.6
9. $25000 TO $34999	30 5.1	5 1.5	18 22.2	53 5.2
10. $35000 AND OVER	8 1.4	1 0.3	12 14.8	21 2.1
COLUMN TOTAL	591 58.5	338 33.5	81 8.0	1010 100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 42

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-14

TOTAL FAMILY INCOME IF NOT WORKING BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
               COUNT  I
             COL PCT  ISES       NON-      40+           ROW
                      I          PROFIT                  TOTAL
                      I      1.I       2.I       3.I
            ----------I--------I---------I---------I
                   1. I   175  I    60   I    16   I     251
UNDER $2000           I  30.6  I   18.4  I   20.0  I    25.7
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   2. I   102  I    90   I     5   I     197
$2000 TO $3999        I  17.9  I   27.6  I    6.3  I    20.2
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   3. I    84  I    58   I     8   I     150
$4000 TO $5999        I  14.7  I   17.8  I   10.0  I    15.4
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   4. I    63  I    40   I    10   I     113
$6000 TO $7999        I  11.0  I   12.3  I   12.5  I    11.6
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   5. I    41  I    28   I     3   I      72
$8000 TO $9999        I   7.2  I    8.6  I    3.8  I     7.4
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   6. I    69  I    31   I    13   I     113
$10000 TO $14999      I  12.1  I    9.5  I   16.3  I    11.6
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   7. I    27  I    14   I    12   I      53
$15000 TO $19999      I   4.7  I    4.3  I   15.0  I     5.4
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   8. I     8  I     4   I     9   I      21
$20000 TO $24999      I   1.4  I    1.2  I   11.3  I     2.1
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                   9. I     2  I     1   I     1   I       4
$25000 TO $34999      I   0.4  I    0.3  I    1.3  I     0.4
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
                  10. I     0  I     0   I     3   I       3
$35000 AND OVER       I   0.0  I    0.0  I    3.8  I     0.3
                     -I--------I---------I---------I
              COLUMN     571       326        80         977
               TOTAL    58.4      33.4       8.2       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       75
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-15

HOW FAMILY WOULD MANAGE IF NOT WORKING BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
        COUNT  I
      COL PCT  ISES         NON-       40+            ROW
               I            PROFIT                    TOTAL
               I        1.I        2.I        3.I
      ---------I---------I---------I---------I
           1.  I    24   I    23   I     3   I      50
 VERY WELL     I   4.1   I   7.0   I   3.8   I     5.0
              -I---------I---------I---------I
           2.  I   109   I    70   I    14   I     193
 FAIRLY WELL   I  18.6   I  21.2   I  17.5   I    19.4
              -I---------I---------I---------I
           3.  I   212   I   127   I    28   I     367
 WITH DIFFICULTY I 36.1  I  38.5   I  35.0   I    36.8
              -I---------I---------I---------I
           4.  I   140   I    72   I    13   I     225
 W GRT DIFFICULTY I 23.9 I  21.8   I  16.3   I    22.6
              -I---------I---------I---------I
           5.  I   102   I    38   I    22   I     162
 NOT AT ALL    I  17.4   I  11.5   I  27.5   I    16.2
              -I---------I---------I---------I
       COLUMN      587       330        80         997
        TOTAL     58.9      33.1       8.0       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        55
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-16

WOULD WORK EVEN IF MONEY NOT NEEDED BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
                COUNT   I
                COL PCT ISES        NON-       40+         ROW
                        I           PROFIT                 TOTAL
                        I        1.I        2.I        3.I
                --------I---------I---------I---------I
                     1. I    94   I    63   I     6   I     163
NO                      I  15.5   I  18.5   I   7.5   I    15.8
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     2. I   384   I   225   I    69   I     678
YES                     I  63.2   I  66.0   I  86.3   I    65.9
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     3. I   130   I    53   I     5   I     188
DONT KNOW               I  21.4   I  15.5   I   6.3   I    18.3
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                COLUMN      608        341        80       1029
                TOTAL      59.1       33.1       7.8      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       23
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-17

JOB SOUGHT (OCCUPATIONAL GROUP) BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

COUNT COL PCT	SES 1.	NON-PROFIT 2.	40+ 3.	ROW TOTAL
1. PROF-TECH	68 11.8	23 7.1	28 34.6	119 12.1
2. MANAGER-ADMIN	61 10.6	18 5.5	43 53.1	122 12.4
3. SALES	37 6.4	27 8.3	4 4.9	68 6.9
4. CLERICAL	118 20.4	97 29.8	0 0.0	215 21.8
5. CRAFTS	61 10.6	21 6.5	1 1.2	83 8.4
6. OPERATIVE	17 2.9	3 0.9	0 0.0	20 2.0
7. TRANSP OPERATOR	8 1.4	3 0.9	0 0.0	11 1.1
8. LABORER EX FARM	18 3.1	4 1.2	0 0.0	22 2.2
9. SERVICE	52 9.0	28 8.6	1 1.2	81 8.2
10. HOUSEHOLD WORKER	12 2.1	24 7.4	0 0.0	36 3.7
11. FARMERS	4 0.7	0 0.0	0 0.0	4 0.4
13. UNCODABLE	32 5.5	13 4.0	1 1.2	46 4.7
15. DONT KNOW	90 15.6	64 19.7	3 3.7	157 16.0
COLUMN TOTAL	578 58.7	325 33.0	81 8.2	984 100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS = 68

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-18

JOB SOUGHT (JS) COMPARED TO RECENT JOB[1] BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE[2]

```
         COUNT  I
       COL PCT  ISES         NON-       40+             ROW
                I            PROFIT                     TOTAL
                I        1.I        2.I        3.I
       ---------I---------I---------I---------I
            1.  I   368   I   159   I    61   I    588
 SAME TYPE JS   I  60.6   I  47.3   I  79.2   I   57.6
               -I---------I---------I---------I
            2.  I    75   I    74   I    12   I    161
 DIFFERENT TYPE J I  12.4   I  22.0   I  15.6   I   15.8
               -I---------I---------I---------I
            3.  I   160   I   102   I     4   I    266
 DONT KNOW JS   I  26.4   I  30.4   I   5.2   I   26.1
               -I---------I---------I---------I
            4.  I     4   I     1   I     0   I      5
 DONT KNOW JS   I   0.7   I   0.3   I   0.0   I    0.5
               -I---------I---------I---------I
        COLUMN      607       336        77       1020
         TOTAL     59.5      32.9       7.5      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        32
```

---

[1] "Same Type Job Sought" means job sought and recent job are in the same category (see the 12 categories used for tabulation of recent job); "Don't Know Job Sought" means job sought couldn't be coded because of insufficient or unclear information; "Don't Know Job Sought-3" means information on desired pay, number of work hours or restrictions for job sought were given but the job description was not codable; "Don't Know Job Sought-4" means no information on job sought was given.

[2] Respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older. Cases missing from the tabulation are respondents who failed to describe the duties or title of their recent job, and two cases where the recent job was described but uncodable.

Table C-19

DESIRED HOURS PER WEEK IN JOB SOUGHT BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
             COUNT  I
           COL PCT  ISES        NON-       40+          ROW
                    I           PROFIT                  TOTAL
                    I       1.I       2.I       3.I
           ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                2.  I      1  I      0  I      0  I        1
  5 TO 9 HRS        I    0.2  I    0.0  I    0.0  I      0.1
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                3.  I      1  I      6  I      0  I        7
  10 TO 14 HRS      I    0.2  I    1.9  I    0.0  I      0.7
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                4.  I     10  I     15  I      0  I       25
  15 TO 19 HRS      I    1.7  I    4.6  I    0.0  I      2.5
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                5.  I     77  I     84  I      0  I      161
  20 TO 24 HRS      I   13.1  I   25.9  I    0.0  I     16.2
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                6.  I     20  I     27  I      1  I       48
  25 TO 29 HRS      I    3.4  I    8.3  I    1.3  I      4.8
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                7.  I     27  I     32  I      5  I       64
  30 TO 34 HRS      I    4.6  I    9.9  I    6.3  I      6.4
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                8.  I    425  I    155  I     63  I      643
  35 TO 40 HRS      I   72.0  I   47.8  I   79.7  I     64.8
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
                9.  I     29  I      5  I     10  I       44
  OVER 40 HRS       I    4.9  I    1.5  I   12.7  I      4.4
                   -I---------I---------I---------I
            COLUMN       590       324        79          993
             TOTAL      59.4      32.6       8.0        100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      59
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-20

ANNUAL EARNINGS DESIRED IN JOB SOUGHT BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
              COUNT  I
            COL PCT  ISES         NON-         40+           ROW
                     I            PROFIT                     TOTAL
                     I        1.I        2.I        3.I
            ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                  1. I      8  I     15  I      2  I      25
UNDER $2000          I    1.5  I    5.2  I    2.5  I     2.8
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  2. I     65  I     89  I      0  I     154
$2000 TO $3999       I   12.1  I   30.6  I    0.0  I    17.0
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  3. I     76  I     71  I      0  I     147
$4000 TO $5999       I   14.2  I   24.4  I    0.0  I    16.2
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  4. I    108  I     62  I      0  I     170
$6000 TO $7999       I   20.1  I   21.3  I    0.0  I    18.7
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  5. I     65  I     21  I      2  I      88
$8000 TO $9999       I   12.1  I    7.2  I    2.5  I     9.7
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  6. I    126  I     18  I      8  I     152
$10000 TO $14999     I   23.5  I    6.2  I   10.0  I    16.7
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  7. I     52  I     11  I     17  I      80
$15000 TO $19999     I    9.7  I    3.8  I   21.3  I     8.8
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  8. I     23  I      1  I     20  I      44
$20000 TO $24999     I    4.3  I    0.3  I   25.0  I     4.8
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  9. I     12  I      3  I     27  I      42
$25000 TO $34999     I    2.2  I    1.0  I   33.8  I     4.6
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                 10. I      2  I      0  I      4  I       6
$35000 AND OVER      I    0.4  I    0.0  I    5.0  I     0.7
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
              COLUMN      537       291        80        908
               TOTAL     59.1      32.0       8.8      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      144
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-21

DIFFERENCE IN HOURLY PAY IN RECENT JOB AND JOB SOUGHT BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
           COUNT  I
         COL PCT  ISES        NON-      40+            ROW
                  I           PROFIT                   TOTAL
                  I       1.I       2.I       3.I
         ---------I---------I---------I---------I
               1.  I    85   I    76   I    14   I     175
DECR OVER 25%      I  16.3   I  29.1   I  19.7   I    20.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               2.  I   107   I    44   I    15   I     166
DECR 5-25%         I  20.5   I  16.9   I  21.1   I    19.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               3.  I   171   I    48   I    24   I     243
SAME PAY           I  32.8   I  18.4   I  33.8   I    28.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               4.  I    87   I    36   I     9   I     132
INCR 5-25%         I  16.7   I  13.8   I  12.7   I    15.5
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
               5.  I    71   I    57   I     9   I     137
INCREASE OVER 25   I  13.6   I  21.8   I  12.7   I    16.1
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
          COLUMN       521       261        71         853
           TOTAL      61.1      30.6       8.3       100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      199
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-22

RESTRICTIONS PLACED ON JOB SOUGHT BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
                COUNT  ISES       NON-      40+
               COL PCT I          PROFIT                ROW
                       I                                TOTAL
                       I     1   I      2   I      3   I
              ---------I---------I----------I----------I
                   V61 I   363   I    209   I     45   I   617
  EVENING, NIGHT WORK  I  58.5   I   59.5   I   55.6   I  58.7
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V62 I   310   I    186   I     30   I   526
  LIFTING OVER 20 LBS  I  50.0   I   53.0   I   37.0   I  50.0
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V63 I   359   I    209   I      8   I   576
  OUT-OF-TOWN TRAVEL   I  57.9   I   59.5   I    9.9   I  54.8
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V64 I   465   I    283   I     37   I   785
  MOVE TO ANOTHER CITY I  75.0   I   80.6   I   45.7   I  74.6
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V65 I   147   I     98   I      5   I   250
  WORKING OVERTIME     I  23.7   I   27.9   I    6.2   I  23.8
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V66 I   187   I    145   I      4   I   336
  COMMUTE OVER 30 MINS I  30.2   I   41.3   I    4.9   I  31.9
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V67 I   244   I    127   I      4   I   375
  NO PUBLIC TRANSPORT  I  39.4   I   36.2   I    4.9   I  35.6
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                   V68 I   314   I    231   I     17   I   562
  HIGH PRESSURE JOB    I  50.6   I   65.8   I   21.0   I  53.4
                       I---------I----------I----------I
                COLUMN     620        351         81      1052
                 TOTAL    58.9       33.4        7.7     100.0
PERCENTS AND TOTALS BASED ON RESPONDENTS

   1052 VALID CASES              0 MISSING CASES
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-23

CONFIDENCE IN FINDING THE RIGHT JOB SOON BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
          COUNT   I
        COL PCT   ISES        NON-        40+          ROW
                  I           PROFIT                   TOTAL
                  I        1.I        2.I        3.I
         ---------I---------I---------I---------I
              1.  I    91   I    78   I    17   I      186
  VERY CONFIDENT  I  14.9   I  23.8   I  21.5   I     18.3
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              2.  I   172   I   100   I    17   I      289
SOMEWT CONFIDENT  I  28.2   I  30.5   I  21.5   I     28.4
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              3.  I   140   I    64   I    22   I      226
NOT CONF OR DISC  I  23.0   I  19.5   I  27.8   I     22.2
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              4.  I   132   I    54   I    14   I      200
 SMWTDISCOURAGED  I  21.7   I  16.5   I  17.7   I     19.7
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
              5.  I    74   I    32   I     9   I      115
VERY DISCOURAGED  I  12.2   I   9.8   I  11.4   I     11.3
                 -I---------I---------I---------I
          COLUMN      609       328        79         1016
           TOTAL     59.9      32.3       7.8        100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =        36
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-24

RETIRED FROM A PREVIOUS JOB BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
              COUNT   I
             COL PCT  ISES         NON-        40+            ROW
                      I            PROFIT                     TOTAL
                      I         1.I         2.I         3.I
             ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                 1.   I    223  I    158  I     29  I     410
  YES                 I   36.1  I   45.5  I   36.3  I    39.2
                     -I---------I---------I---------I
                 2.   I    395  I    189  I     51  I     635
  NO                  I   63.9  I   54.5  I   63.8  I    60.8
                     -I---------I---------I---------I
              COLUMN       618       347        80       1045
               TOTAL      59.1      33.2       7.7      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =         7
```

---

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-25

FORCED TO RETIRE BY EMPLOYER BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
            COUNT    I
            COL PCT  ISES      NON-       40+           ROW
                     I         PROFIT                   TOTAL
                     I        1.I       2.I       3.I
            ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                  1. I   109   I   102   I    12   I    223
    NO               I  49.1   I  64.2   I  42.9   I   54.5
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
                  2. I   113   I    57   I    16   I    186
    YES              I  50.9   I  35.8   I  57.1   I   45.5
                    -I---------I---------I---------I
            COLUMN       222       159        28        409
             TOTAL      54.3      38.9       6.8      100.0

    NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =      643
```

---

*Respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, non-profit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older and who had retired from a previous job.

Table C-26

AGE GROUP BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
             COUNT   I
           COL PCT   ISES        NON-       40+            ROW
                     I           PROFIT                   TOTAL
                     I        1.I        2.I        3.I
          --------I--------I--------I--------I
                 2.  I   423   I   196   I    73   I      692
55 TO 64             I  68.2   I  55.8   I  90.1   I     65.8
                    -I--------I--------I--------I
                 3.  I   197   I   155   I     8   I      360
65 OR OLDER          I  31.8   I  44.2   I   9.9   I     34.2
                    -I--------I--------I--------I
            COLUMN       620       351        81         1052
             TOTAL      58.9      33.4       7.7        100.0
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

Table C-27

HIGHEST LEVEL OF SCHOOL COMPLETED BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
          COUNT  I
        COL PCT  ISES       NON-      40+          ROW
                 I          PROFIT                 TOTAL
                 I      1.I      2.I      3.I
        .--------I--------I--------I--------I
             1.  I   85   I   36   I    0   I     121
GRADE 8 OR LESS  I  13.8  I  10.3  I   0.0  I    11.6
                -I--------I--------I--------I
             2.  I  134   I   59   I    2   I     195
SOME HIGH SCHOOL I  21.8  I  17.0  I   2.5  I    18.7
                -I--------I--------I--------I
             3.  I  167   I  119   I    5   I     291
HIGH SCHOOL GRAD I  27.2  I  34.2  I   6.2  I    27.9
                -I--------I--------I--------I
             4.  I  133   I   77   I   16   I     226
SOME COLLEGE     I  21.7  I  22.1  I  19.8  I    21.7
                -I--------I--------I--------I
             5.  I   57   I   35   I   34   I     126
COLLEGE GRAD     I   9.3  I  10.1  I  42.0  I    12.1
                -I--------I--------I--------I
             6.  I   38   I   22   I   24   I      84
ADVANCED DEGREE  I   6.2  I   6.3  I  29.6  I     8.1
                -I--------I--------I--------I
         COLUMN      614      348       81       1043
          TOTAL      58.9     33.4     7.8      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       9
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

246

Table C-28

MARITAL STATUS BY TYPE OF EMPLOYMENT OFFICE*

```
                COUNT  I
                COL PCT ISES         NON-        40+         ROW
                        I            PROFIT                  TOTAL
                        I        1.I        2.I        3.I
               ---------I---------I---------I---------I
                     1. I   377   I   188   I    59   I    624
MARRIED                 I   61.0  I   53.7  I   73.8  I   59.5
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     2. I    39   I    20   I     7   I     66
SINGLE-NVR MAR          I    6.3  I    5.7  I    8.8  I    6.3
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     3. I    28   I     9   I     2   I     39
SEPARATED               I    4.5  I    2.6  I    2.5  I    3.7
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     4. I    87   I    45   I     8   I    140
DIVORCED                I   14.1  I   12.9  I   10.0  I   13.4
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                     5. I    87   I    88   I     4   I    179
WIDOWED                 I   14.1  I   25.1  I    5.0  I   17.1
                       -I---------I---------I---------I
                 COLUMN     618        350         80       1048
                  TOTAL     59.0       33.4        7.6      100.0

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS =       4
```

*All respondents to the job seeker survey (from State Employment Service offices, nonprofit employment offices, and Forty Plus clubs) who were 55 years of age or older.

247